

The Classical Review

NEW SERIES VOLUME III NO. 3, 4

(VOLUME LXVII OF THE CONTINUOUS SERIES)

December 1953

ARISTOPHANES, *FROGS* 818–21

ἔσται δ' ἵππολόφων τε λόγων κορυθαίολα νείκη
σχινδαλάμων τε παραξόνια σμιλευματοέργου
φωτὸς ἀμυνομένου φρενοτέκτονος ἀνδρὸς
ρήμαθ' ἵπποβάμονα.

819 σμιλευματοέργου Heiberg, rec. Coulon: σμιλεύματά τ' ἔργων codd.

WITH the traditional reading in 819, *φρενοτέκτονος* in 820 is so placed that any reader or listener will first take it with *φωτὸς*; then, upon finishing the sentence, he will feel that *ἀνδρὸς* without an epithet is, in these circumstances, unexpectedly vague. For the modern student this ambiguity is resolved by editorial notes which give sound reasons for seeing in those last four words one phrase alluding to Aeschylus. But in that case the single and colourless term *φωτὸς* provides a wretchedly inadequate counterpoise. And why is the subtle and exacting technician indicated by the preceding line now thus summarily and yet vaguely denoted by the generic term 'man' (or 'fellow')?

Heiberg's correction, for which the way was opened by the note of Van Leeuwen, appears to me indispensable. There is no antithesis between *φωτὸς* and *ἀνδρὸς*; the reason why Aristophanes does not here use *ἀνὴρ* with both terms, as he did at *Ach.* 707, may—I suppose—now be seen; it was to avoid interlinear hiatus.¹ Another advantage of course is that we get rid of *ἔργων*, for what is here in question is not works but criticisms of works; a contest, *νείκη* 818.

παραξόνια means 'linch-pins'; see L.S.J.; and since 'linch-pins of splinters' (or 'of quibbles') is not extravagance but drivel, here too emendation is necessary. So much so, that Herwerden's *παραξόανα*, a word which is not only not extant but for the existence of which there is no evidence at all, is mentioned even in places so comparatively unreceptive of conjectures as the apparatus of Hall and Geldart and the notes in the school-edition of Merry. What it might denote I cannot guess. A *σμιλευματοέργος* might have been said *παραξείν*, on occasion; but our word is not *παραξέσεις*. A *ξόανον* is neither an abstraction nor a process but a concrete object.

I suggest that the original word was *παραψόγια*. In Plato, *Phaedrus* 267 a and context Socrates is making (mildly) merry over the solemn pedantries of the rhetorical sophists; *τὰ κομψὰ τῆς τέχνης* include not only *πίστωσις* but *ἐπιπίστωσις*, not only *ἐλεγχος* but *ἐπεξέλεγχος*; also *ὑποδήλωσις* ('sub-intimation'—J. Wright). At 260 b–c we had spoken of rhetorical *ἔπαινοι*; but these people have coined such terms as *παρέπαινοι*—and *παράψογοι*. Now since

¹ At 815 the variant *οδόντας* is admissible. These dactylic passages give an impression of pace.

ὑποδήλωσις appears to mean insinuation, what I should understand from παράψογος would be *indirect* censure—certainly important to a rhetorician. Nothing, surely, could be more suitable for the content and diction of our passage, except to coin in turn the diminutive—‘delicate by-criticisms’. This also matches the other nominative, νείκη ‘contentions’, a term to which ‘shavings’ stood in false relation and ‘linch-pins’ in none at all. σχινδάλαμοι are petty points or niceties (*Clouds* 130) and that the word could be applied to small *flaws* as objects of *criticism* is clear from Lucian, *Hesiodus* 5 σχινδαλάμους καὶ ἀκάνθας τινὰς ἐκλέγεις κτλ. For -ψόγ- cf. ψέγειν 1129.

Throughout this lyric the imagery consistently shows Aeschylus as the representative of vehemence and indignation, Euripides of technique and criticism (ἐπὼν βασανίστρια, ῥήματα δαιομένη).

The sophist who invented the terms παρέπαινος and παράψογος was Euenus of Paros, a rhetorician and poet whom we know from *Phaedo* 60 d and *Apol.* 20 a to have been a contemporary of our comedian’s arch-sophist and butt, Socrates, and to have been in Athens about six years after the production of the *Frogs*. That Aristophanes had some acquaintance with his ideas is probable, for he clearly enjoyed a certain degree of notoriety. One of his technicalities was the word ὑποδήλωσις mentioned above, and Aristophanes has ὑπεδήλωσε at *Thesm.* 1011; there may be nothing in that; but otherwise this rare compound is only late.

And now I wonder more than ever that the composer of these four quatrains should have devised this as the second and not the fourth. For example, of the three ῥήματα, that in 824 is obviously annunciative; in 828 the term is allusive, and so it should be in ‘821’. Similarly with λοφιᾶς 822 and -λόφων in ‘818’. And consider the whole sequence.

Cambridge

A. Y. CAMPBELL

THE ORIGIN OF θυμοειδής

JAEGER has pointed out (“The Medical Origin of θυμοειδής”, *Eranos*, 1946) that θυμοειδής first appears in the Hippocratic *Airs, Waters, Places*, which belongs to the latter half of the fifth century B.C.¹ Now in the Hippocratic Corpus θυμός itself appears only in the phrase θυμός βήξαι, ‘a desire to cough’ (e.g. *Prog.* 8, 17; *Coac.* 23), being a relic of a Homeric usage generally replaced in Plato’s day by ἐπιθυμία, but as it were fossilized here in the unchanging Ionic of the Greek scientist. And θυμοειδής, though perhaps (as -ειδής suggests) coined in Hippocratic circles, is derived from θυμός as it was used in the layman’s language. This point is itself worth noting, if only to avoid possible misunderstanding of ‘medical origin’ in this context: there is no Hippocratic conception of θυμός as an entity at work in man, from which θυμοειδής is derived.

But more important than that: to appreciate the significance of θυμοειδής in the Platonic tripartition of the soul we must in fact look once more to the language of the layman, or rather to that of a different sort of specialist, viz. the fancier of horses and dogs. For to call θυμοειδής a Hippocratic invention and leave it at that misses much.

¹ See Heinimann, *Nomos und Physis*, pp. 170 ff.

Airs, Waters, Places is ethnological rather than strictly medical. The writer's thesis is that the feature distinguishing Europeans from Asiatics is 'spirit'—an idea that no doubt owed its origin to consideration of the Persian invasions. This quality is called at one time τὸ θυμοειδές (23), at another τὸ ἄγριον καὶ θηριώδες (24). And here we have a clue to our word's colour by Plato's day: it described what was primarily an animal quality.

In Xenophon's works it is abundantly clear that θυμοειδής is the huntsman's word for a 'keen' or 'mettled' horse (see *An.* iv. 5. 36; *Symp.* 2. 10; *Eq.* 1. 8, 9. 1, 9. 8, 10. 17; *Mem.* iv. 1. 3); and it must be this usage, rather than any real antithesis between θυμός and ὀργή, that leads him to comment that θυμός is to a horse as ὀργή is to a man (*Eq.* 9. 2), since in fact he does not hesitate to use ὀργή of a horse (*Eq.* 9. 7). Though he never uses θυμοειδής to describe dogs, such usage is implicit in his technical application of θυμός to a dog that is close to its quarry (*Cyn.* 4. 4); and θυμός is second on his list of names suitable for dogs (*Cyn.* 7. 5).

That Plato is conscious of this specialized meaning seems clear enough: θυμοειδής describes horses and dogs before it is applied to the guards as a requisite quality (*Rep.* 375 a; cf. 467 e). And though elsewhere (e.g. 410 b) he applies the term to humans without such prior reference to animals, when he wishes to use τὸ θυμοειδές as a technical term in his tripartition of man's soul, he again as it were gives the term its proper context first: the simile of the shepherd and his dog (440 d) paves the way for its application to man. Until this is done the intolerably awkward alternatives τὸ τοῦ θυμοῦ and ὃ θυμούμεθα are employed (439 e).

It thus seems probable that Plato consciously borrowed this term from hunting talk; so that implicit in his usage was the notion that, as in the good horse or dog, so in man the quality it denoted should be under due control. His circle, familiar with the nuisance caused by horses and dogs with too much θυμοειδές (and the worthlessness of those with too little), would no doubt see the point at once. And here Plato is once again answering the devotees of φύσις by his usual method of hoisting them with their own petard:¹ for just as elsewhere he borrows their jargon and emphasizes that his city is built κατὰ φύσιν (*Rep.* 428 e), so here he is intentionally following their example in going to 'nature' for his terminology. But the 'nature' to which they loved to refer was of course 'nature in the raw'; and here correction of that tendency is implied in Plato's concern with its higher and controlled forms. It is the same elsewhere: bees (*Rep.* 520 b, 552 c), dogs (404 a, 537 a), and horses (413 d) provide his parallels; and it is typical of his use of φύσις that the φύλαξ will be like a watchdog, not like a wolf (416 a).

If hunting talk provided the term, it should be added that a Homeric passage seems to have helped Plato towards the idea of man's sharing this characteristic specifically with the dog. There (*Od.* xx. 1 ff.) we naturally find a more primitive conception: the roused spirit is a dog inside man that 'barks' (l. 13) and needs soothing by its owner. Metaphor then yields place to a simile in which the idea is more fully worked out. Now undoubtedly Plato was deeply impressed by these lines: he quotes from them both in the *Phaedo* (94 d) and in the *Republic* (390 d). And since his introduction of τὸ θυμοειδές as a soul-part is preceded (*Rep.* 440 d) by a passage strongly reminiscent of the Homeric lines, in which control of one's spirit is expressed in terms of a comparable

¹ See T. A. Sinclair in *C.R.* lxii (1948) 61.

simile, one might maintain, even without additional evidence, that here once more the passage was in his mind. Any doubt on the matter is removed by what follows: to show that τὸ θυμοειδές and τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν are distinct he actually quotes from the passage for the third time (441 b). Assuredly it was never far from his thoughts in this context.

University of Leeds

E. L. HARRISON

ENNIUS, CATO, AND SURUS

Festus, p. 362. 26 L.: item (Ennius) 'unum [u]surum surus ferre, tamen defendere possunt'.
Suri autem sunt fustes, et hypocoristicos surculi.

26 unum usurum surus ferre *F*: unus surus surum ferret *Epit.* (p. 383): scribe unu'
surum Suru' ferre (*vix* unu' Surum suru' ferre). 27 possent *F* (p. 382).

Festus, p. 382. 25 L.: 'surum dicebant, ex quo <surculus> . . . <in> usu est . . . [32] <Ennius: unus s>urum surus <ferre, tamen defende>re possent'.

32 urus (*u- minus cert.*) *Fc* [u]surum surus *Fp*. 362: <s>urus surum *F hoc loco*: scribe unu'
surum Suru', *vix* unu' Surum suru'.

Pauli Excerpta, p. 383, 12: 'surum' dicebant, ex quo per deminutionem fit surculus. Ennius: 'unus surus surum ferret, tamen defendere possent.'

13 ferret *etiam Basil.*: feret *E ante corr.*

Ennius, *Annals*: Surum unum unus ferre, tamen defendere possent (Vahlen³, fr. 525; Steuart, *incertae sedis* fr. 89).

surum unum unus ferre, tamen defendere posset (Warmington, fr. 484).

EDITORS of this fragment of Ennius seem to have made little of it. Vahlen (*Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*²) comments: 'versum paene desperatum corr.'; E. H. Warmington (*Remains of Old Latin*, i. 181) agrees that it 'is almost hopeless'; E. M. Steuart (*The Annals of Quintus Ennius*, p. 226) believes that the reading of Vahlen 'seems the simplest remedy, where both the order and the terminations of the words have been badly confused'. But while attempts to establish the reading have not reached any very satisfactory conclusion, no one, so far as I know, has sought a solution by bringing in the help of Cato and an elephant. The evidence is to be found in Pliny (*N.H.* viii. 11):

Antipater auctor est duos (elephantos) Antiocho regi in bellicis usibus celebres etiam cognominibus fuisse; etenim novere ea. certe Cato cum imperatorum nomina annalibus detraxerit eum (elephantum) qui fortissime proeliatu esset in Punica acie Surum tradidit vocatum altero dente mutilato.

Whatever precisely Pliny means, he clearly tells us two things: that there was a Carthaginian elephant named Surus and that it had one tusk broken (? off). Since the name of any Carthaginian war-elephant would normally be either Punic or Greek, Surus probably means 'Syrian', which is the meaning attributed to it by Lewis and Short, by F. Münzer (Pauly-Wissowa, s.v.), and by H. Rackham (Loeb Pliny, loc. cit.). But this involves a difficulty which has not been faced. It is certain that the species of elephant normally used by the Carthaginians and by Hannibal was the African (for the numismatic evidence, which even by itself is decisive, see H. H. Scullard, *Num. Chron.*, 6th Ser., viii, 1948, pp. 156 ff.) and not the Indian, which alone could appropriately be called Syrian in the sense of Eastern (the war-elephants of the Seleucid kings of Syria were of course Indian). A solution of this difficulty, however, can be found in some further numismatic evidence, which has hitherto been

neglected but which makes it in the highest degree probable that Hannibal had also a few, though certainly not many, Indian elephants (for the coins, and the political complications which this view involves, see Sir William Gowers and H. H. Scullard, *Num. Chron.* x, 1950, pp. 271 ff.). Thus in view of the superiority which ancient authors with one voice ascribe to the Indian over the African elephant, it is not unlikely that the famous Carthaginian beast mentioned by Cato and Pliny was an Indian called the Syrian, a name which would be particularly suitable in that it would mark out the animal from the main bulk of Hannibal's African elephants.¹

When the Romans first encountered this formidable opponent in battle they probably soon learnt its name, Surus, and since they would presumably understand this to mean the Syrian, that would perhaps have led no further if Surus had been an ordinary elephant. But he was not: besides being the bravest of his fellows, he was conspicuous as a One-Tusker (*altero dente mutilato*). In these circumstances it would be strange if the Roman legionaries did not immediately think of the Latin word *surus*, meaning 'a stake'. They carried their own stakes (*suri*) to build defensive palisades: the elephant had its one stake with which to defend the Punic troops. Or, since Festus says *suri autem sunt fustes*, the Romans may have thought of the cudgels with which military discipline was maintained (cf. *fustuarium*): the elephant's tusk might be more formidable than a centurion's club. Such a natural transference of meaning is made all the more likely when we recall that the Romans, although in many ways a solemn people, had a weakness for puns. Of this we are reminded for instance by the canting 'types parlants' on Roman Republican coinage, while it is also abundantly clear that the Romans did not differ from soldiers of all ages who have always delighted to find nicknames for their own or their enemies' weapons.² And in this case they did not have to look far: the real name could be a Latin nickname, and the Syrian could be the Stake.

In the light of this, I would suggest that the primary meaning of Cato's phrase 'Surum . . . vocatum altero dente mutilato' is that the elephant 'was called the Syrian and it had one broken tusk', which is the translation of H. Rackham, rather than that it was called the Stake (by the Romans) *because* of its broken tusk, although this second idea also was probably in the writer's mind.

In any restoration of the line of Ennius, I suggest that this double meaning of *surus* (the elephant and a stake) should be sought, and that we are forced to conclude that Ennius wrote here with a light touch. But such a conclusion need not remain a mere hypothesis. By good fortune the final bit of evidence, though fragmentary, is still preserved: Festus says 'Ennius iocatus videtur . . . item "unum (u)surum surus ferre" . . .'³

¹ It is possible, in view of the extreme rarity of Indian elephants in Hannibal's forces, that we have a portrait of Surus on the coinage (see *Num. Chron.* 1950, pl. xvi, a, b, c).

² Cf. e.g. *aries*, *corvus*, *cuniculus*, *musculus*, *onager*, *testudo* (on *triarii* see F. W. Walbank, *C.R.* lxiv. 10 f.). See further E.S. McCartney, *i Figurative Uses of Animal Names in Latin and their Application to Military Devices* (Dissert. Pennsylvannia, 1912); W. Heraeus, 'Die römische Soldatensprache' (*Archiv. für lat.*

Lexikogr. xii, 1902, pp. 155 ff., and *Nachträge in Kleine Schriften* (1937), pp. 151 ff.).

³ Festus, p. 362. 19 ff. L.: 'RIGIDO . . . Ennius iocatus videtur . . . li est enim a manis no- . . . re usus est. Et lib. II: '... i caerula prata', cael- . . . et alibi: 'Inde parum . . . ulabant', Parum insulam refert. Item: 'Unum (u)surum surus ferre, tamen defendere possunt'. The pun could of course have been Ennius' own, but I think that it is much more likely to have arisen in the ranks of the Roman army, as suggested

W. M. Lindsay (*supra*) and W. Heraeus¹ read 'unus surum Surus ferre, tamen defendere possent'. I do not know what precise meaning they saw in 'Surus' the Syrian, but it is possible to accept this reading and explain the line by reference to the elephant, i.e. only Surus carried a stake, but nevertheless the Carthaginians could defend (their position or camp?—though they had no stakes with which to fortify it). An alternative suggestion, which may offer better sense but present more difficulty, would be 'surum unum Surus ferre, tamen defendere posset', meaning that Surus could bring only one stake, yet could make a good defence. This restoration is based on an assumption: that, while the *u* of Surus (Syrian) is certainly short, the *u* of *surus* (stake) is long. This is not beyond all doubt, although Lewis and Short give *ū*, and the *Thesaurus Ling. Lat.* gives *crebrisūrus*.² The word *surus* occurs only once again in the fragments of Ennius in *crebrisuro* (Paul. ex Fest. p. 51 L.). If this fragment, which consists of this single word, comes from the *Annals* and thus from a hexameter, we should of course have to accept *sūrus*, but in fact there is no evidence that it does (Vahlen placed it among the *Incerta* (35) and not among the *Annalium Lib. Inc.*). If nevertheless the supposition of a long *u* is felt to create difficulty, then we may fall back on the reading to which Lindsay and Heraeus lent their authority.

If the main suggestion of this note commends itself to others, I must leave it to better Latinists to decide the best reading, but I believe that an historical connexion links this fragment of Ennius with that of Cato's *Origines* (88 Peter), and that therefore the former should be placed somewhere in Book viii or ix of the *Annales*.³

King's College, London

H. H. SCULLARD

THE RAM AND CERBERUS

(Ovid, *A.A.* iii. 173–8; *Met.* vii. 408–9)

1. *A.A.* iii. 173 aeris ecce color, tum cum sine nubibus aer,
nec tepidus pluuias concitat Auster aquas;
ecce tibi similis, quae quondam Phrixon et Hellen
diceris Inois eripuisse dolis;
hic undas imitatur, habet quoque nomen ab undis;
crediderim nymphas hac ego ueste tegi.
175 *qui* codd. interpol.

It is generally believed that the reference of 175–6 is to the Golden-fleeced Ram. For Ovid, as for others, the Ram is properly masculine, being identified above, and to have been taken over by Ennius.

¹ *Rhein. Museum*, lxxix (1930), p. 271 = *Klein. Schr.*, p. 251. Cf. O. Skutsch, *C.Q.* xlii (1948), p. 98, to whose kindness I owe this reference.

² On the other hand, Ernout and Meillet, *Dict. Etym.*³ (1951), s.v. *surus* give *ū*?, while A. Walde, *Lat. Etym. Wörterb.*, says: 'ū, nicht ū. vgl. Stowasser Comm. Wölfflin 25 ff.'

³ It has not been certain whether Surus fought in the First or Second Punic War though the latter seemed the more probable

(cf. Scullard, op. cit., 1950, p. 283, n. 43). If the Ennius fragment is relevant, and if, as is almost certain, Ennius did not record the First in any detail (on this problem see O. Skutsch, *C.Q.* xlii. 96 ff.), then it must have been in the Second. N. J. De Witt has advanced the suggestion (*Class. Phil.* 1941, pp. 189–90) that a reference to Surus, the elephant, may be found in Plautus, *Pseudolus* 1218 ff. Finally, I should like to record my gratitude to Professors W. S. Maguinness and L. R. Palmer for having discussed some points with me.

with the sign Aries (*Fast.* iii. 868, iv. 715; *Trist.* iii. 12(13).3), but it is of course also described as *ouis*, always with a specifying epithet such as *Phrixea* or *aurea*. It is accordingly assumed, e.g. by Marchesi (ed. 1933), that *aurea ouis* is here to be supplied in thought as the antecedent of *quae*. This, if not impossible, is at least highly improbable; for *tibi*, like *sibi* at *Trist.* iii. 12. 3., would of itself naturally imply the proper gender. Hence the *qui* of the interpolated tradition and such renderings as that of Bornecque (1929): 'semblable à ta laine, [bélier], toi que, &c.'

It should also be taken into account that Ovid is here recommending *pretio leuiore colores* for women's garments; but only the more expensive fabrics, with actual gold in them, would be likely to imitate the legendary Fleece with any success; the nearest dye for the purpose would probably be the saffron-yellow mentioned at 179. This and his other colour-patterns are all objects in real nature; it may even be that the present example is placed next after 'cloudless sky' as signifying the opposite of this.

As a satisfactory feminine reference there can surely be none better than Nephele, the mother of Phrixus and Helle. As her name implies, she is the 'personified cloud', so that it would be easy to identify her for the present purpose with the phenomenon she represents; compare the familiar case of the personified Aurora (*lutea* at *Fast.* iv. 714, *Met.* vii. 703). Ovid's language elsewhere seems to put the matter beyond doubt; *Fast.* iii. 863 ff. 'adspicit hos, ut forte pependerat aethere mater | . . . inque draconigenam nimbis comitanti-bus urbem | desilit et natos eripit inde suos' (cf. Apollod. i. 9. 1 *Νεφέλη δὲ μετὰ τῆς θνγατρὸς αὐτὸν ἀνήρπασε καὶ . . . χρυσόμαλλον κριὸν ἔδωκεν*); *Heroides* 18(19). 121 ff. 'me miseram! quanto planguntur litora fluctu, | et latet obscura condita nube dies! | forsitan ad pontum mater pia uenerit Helles | mersaque roratis nata fleatur aquis.' The function of the Ram in Ovid is, I think, limited to *uehere* or the like.

Nephele's colour would presumably be that of the rain-cloud, the prevailing sense of *nubes* and *νεφέλη*; dusky, that is, or dark purple (*nigrans*, *κυανέη*). For the cheaper varieties of purple dye see Pliny, *H.N.* ix. 137 f., xvi. 77, xxii. 4; Cic. *Sest.* 19 'nostra hac purpura plebeia ac paene fusca' (cf. *A.A.* iii. 189 'pulla decent niueas').

Paul Brandt (ed. 1902) considers that *quae* refers not to the Ram but to the cloud from which, as he says, the myth of the Ram originated, the colour so indicated being 'ein anderes Blau . . . , offenbar dunkeler Schattierung'. As he refers to Apollodorus (loc. cit.) but does not mention Nephele, it is not altogether clear what grammatical reference he intends for *quae*, unless it be *nubes*. In any case it does not seem likely that Ovid would blur or confuse the figures of Nephele and the Ram in this familiar story.

2. *Met.* vii. 408 illud Echidneae memorant e dentibus ortum
esse canis, etc.
408 lethei 5 (Ehwald)

The difficulty of the expression *Echidneae canis*, if, as seems reasonably certain, the reference is to Cerberus, has long been recognized (cf. Burmann, ed. 1727), though modern editors and lexicographers seem untroubled by it. For since *canis* is, unlike *ouis*, of common gender, *Echidneae* manifestly makes the Hound of Hell a bitch, though he resumes his normal sex almost immediately (413 *qui concitus*). This would appear to be the only recorded instance of a female Cerberus; 'Lygd. 4, 87 -s anguinea' in *T.L.L.* s.v. *canis* is a mishap.

The choice of remedies is clear; we may either, with Bentley and others, cut the knot by reading *Echidnaei*, so leaving *-ae* unexplained; or assume that *canis* has displaced some feminine generic term. This could hardly be other than *ferae*, the first syllable of which might have been lost after *esse* (though unrelated variants are in any case common enough in the text of Ovid); cf. *ferae* and *leae* at *Fast.* v. 178.

As Cerberus is in a sense domesticated this might involve a slight extension of the term; but his sister (Hes. *Th.* 313-14) is so described by Seneca (*Her. O.* 1256 *Lernaeae ferae*), and he himself is in more than one respect a peculiar example of his species.

Oxford

W. M. EDWARDS

OX. PAP. 2256, FR. 3

(i) THE first line contains only the letters ΕΠΙΑΡ], which Mr. Lobel interprets as ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος, adding that ἐπὶ Ἀρχιδημίδου (i.e. 464/3) is 'a theoretical possibility'. It seems, however, that the balance of probability inclines the other way. Not only do the *hypotheses* which include a dating-clause vote heavily for the order ἐπὶ τοῦ δέινα (whether without ἄρχοντος, as in *Persae*, *Septem*, *Philoctetes*, *Birds*; or followed by ἄρχοντος, as in *Alcesteis*, *Medea*, *Hippolytus*, *Phoenissae*, *Acharnians*, *Knights*, *Clouds*, *Lysistrata*, *Frogs*) against ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος τοῦ δέινα (*Agamemnon*, *Wasps*, *Peace*, *Plutus*), but each annual entry in the great didascalie inscription (*I.G.*² ii/iii. 2318) begins ἐπὶ τοῦ δέινα, without mention of, or room for, ἄρχοντος (cf. 23, 41, 52, 120, 165).

(ii) MECATOC has understandably caused some confusion. Mr. Lobel considers, but is inclined to reject, the possibility that these letters give the name of the tragedian who was third to Aeschylus and Sophocles that year. He compares [Eur.] *Ep.* 5, which links Mesatus with Agathon as a rival of Euripides, and Ar. *Vesp.* 1501-2 υἱὸς Καρκίνου | ὁ μέσσετος, on which a scholiast comments οὐ τὸν τραγικὸν λέγει μέσσετον. The tragedian Mesatus does not seem to have made any impression on Schmid-Stählin (he is absent from the indexes to vols. ii and iii), but he may well be real, for all that: (a) the forger of Euripides' letters may be presumed to have seen that it would be wise to give Agathon a real author as his partner; (b) a proper name would make sense in the *Wasps*, and seems to be essential in the *scholion*; (c) there is a suitable place for Mesatus in the victor-list, *I.G.*² ii/iii. 2325. 6, where between 469/8 [Σοφ]οκλῆς ΔΠΠΠ and 'c. 460 [Ἀριστ]ίας — 'we read'....τος II [—?]'.

J. A. DAVISON

University of Leeds

CICERO, DE ORATORE iii. 78

Quid est, quod aut Sex. Pompeius aut duo Balbi aut meus amicus, qui cum Panaetio vixit, M. Vigellius de virtute hominum Stoici possint dicere, qua in disputatione ego his debeam aut vestrum quisquam concedere?

hominum Stoici *codd.*: *secl. Bake*, homines Stoici *vulg.*, omni Stoici *malit Wilkins*.

The text as it stands is impossible for two reasons:

- i. Throughout the passage it is only human virtue that is in question. So *hominum* adds nothing by way of definition.
- ii. Crassus had no need to tell his audience that these persons were Stoics, any more than in the previous sentence that C. Velleius was an Epicurean. And in any case the position of *Stoici*, separated from the rest of the subject and immediately preceding the main verb, is hard to parallel.

It is difficult to see how the reading of the vulgate, acceptable in itself as a gloss, could have become corrupted to *hominum Stoici*. Bake's remedy produces an intelligible text, but does not explain how the offending words came to be there.

It is better to divide the problem into two halves:

- i. *Stoici* is most probably a gloss. For such glosses in the text of the *de Oratore* cf. iii. 51, 69, 80, 182.
- ii. *hominum* is a corruption of something which once stood in the text. Wilkins's conjecture does not give the right sense. What Crassus says is not 'Could they say anything about all virtue, or virtue in general, which we could not say better?' but rather 'Could they say

anything at all about virtue, which we could not say better?' Read *omnino*, which is doubly in place; first, because the sentence is a virtually negative rhetorical question, and secondly, because *omnino* is idiomatic in the second limb of a disjunctive sentence. Cf. *T.L.L.* ii. 1574. 1-22; Merguet, *Lexikon zu den philosophischen Schriften Cicerons*, i. 296. Palaeographically *ōnino* is easily confused with *ominū*.

ROBERT BROWNING

University College, London

LUCAN i. 76-77

tellus extendere litora nolet
excutietque fretum.

IN *C.R.* lxvi (1952), pp. 68-69, A. Hudson-Williams offered a plausible and ingeniously argued emendation of this line. Yet in spite of the passage quoted from vii. 134 ff. the literal sense of the text seems still defensible and indeed preferable. The exact sequence and details of the final catastrophe of the universe are, for the Stoic, matters of speculative imagination rather than of dogma; but in any case the catastrophe of the first book depicts a more advanced stage of cosmic disintegration than that of the seventh. Chaos returns. The first sign of the final disintegration, as depicted in vii. 134 ff., and Sen. *N.Q.* iii. 27 ff., is the flooding of the land; but Lucan has here gone far beyond that. The whole order of the starry heavens is disrupted, *sidera sideribus concurrent*, i. 75; the stars plunge from their places, *ignea pontum | astra petent*, i. 75-76; *tellus*, not simply the dry land, but the globe of earth itself, refuses to observe the ordered limits, of which shore-lines are an oft-cited example, *totaque discors | machina divolsi turbabit foedera mundi*, i. 79-80. As Lejay has accurately phrased it, earth will shake off the sea like a garment. Nothing less forceful will satisfy the demands of the rhetorical climax which culminates in i. 77-79 with the confounding of night and day.

The sequence, it may be noted, inverts that of the first stages of Creation, as portrayed in Genesis i. 5 and 6-9. When that great and terrible day comes, 'when shrivelling like a parched scroll the flaming heavens together roll', then, as in the apocalyptic vision of another Mediterranean writer of Lucan's age, 'there shall be no more sea'.

L. A. MACKAY

University of California

TWO NOTES ON STATIUS, THEBAID

(i) v. 742-3

det pulchra suis libamina virtus
manibus.

IF the funeral games had been in honour of a warrior, *suis manibus* would be intelligible—'let valour pay tribute to a valiant ghost'—but Archemorus is a baby. The correct reading is surely *sui*—'let valour make an offering of itself', i.e. the valour, soon to be shown in battle, is now to show itself in sport. Cf. *Th.* vi. 3-4 *quo Martia bellis | praesudare paret seseque accendere virtus*.

(ii) vi. 847-8

petit aequor uterque
procursu medium atque hausta vestitur
harena.

No editor, as far as I know, has queried *vestitur*, but, apart from the boldness of the expression, there is an impossible anticipation of the next line, *tum madidos artus alterno pulvere siccant*. The correct reading is perhaps *consistit*; corruption might have arisen from dittography—*consistitur arena*. The two champions dash into the ring, scoop up handfuls of sand, take their stand facing each other, and sprinkle each other with the sand. Statius several times uses *alternus* of reciprocal action, e.g. *Th.* ii. 643 *alterna clausurunt lumina dextra*; *Th.* xi. 528-9 *alternaque saevi | murmura . . . rapiunt*.

J. B. POYNTON

Winchester College

REVIEWS

EPIC AND ARCHAIC

HERMANN FRÄNKEL: *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*. Eine Geschichte der griechischen Literatur von Homer bis Pindar. (Philological Monographs, XII.) Pp. xii+680. New York: American Philological Association (Oxford: Blackwell), 1951. Cloth, \$7.00.

FRÄNKEL's survey of early Greek literature extends down to 450 B.C. though excluding Epicharmus and Aeschylus. It is enlivened by translations of generous extracts from the poets which are also paraphrased and discussed, sometimes in considerable detail. Because of its breadth of view, the wealth of its illustrative examples, and its stimulating and often illuminating comments, it is a book in which students and teachers of Greek will find much to admire and to enjoy. Unfortunately it is all in German, and abstract terms, including many coined for the occasion, are by no means absent. It seems a pity that its usefulness should be curtailed in this way. For the book is intended for non-specialists as well as specialists, even for some who will be unfamiliar with the story of the *Iliad* and of the quantitative nature of Greek verse. The non-specialist may also be baffled by the section on Homeric metre, where the importance of metrical phrases grouped around caesurae is rightly stressed, but the term 'caesura' is not explained, and the word 'dactyl' does not seem to occur. There is no corresponding section in the other chapters.

Fränkel's picture of the development of Epic is not very convincing. Born on the Greek mainland, it grew up over the centuries in Asia Minor, being continually revised by poets who retained, and indeed idealized, the antique features to the best of their powers. Of the Trojan Cycle the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were the first poems to become books; in this form they began to be circulated in the eighth or, at latest, seventh century—the chronology seems to depend on a dubious interpretation of out-of-date evidence regarding the prevalence of 'epic' themes in vase-painting. The publishers of these two poems, aided by a romantic insensitiveness to contradictions, snapped up all the best available pieces. Hence the inferiority and comparative brevity of the rest of the cycle, whose redactors had to make do with what was left. It is not decided whether Homer was editor-in-chief of either the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, or was simply the most distinguished contributor to one or other (but not to both) of these two miscellanies. There is much reliance on 'parallels' with Serbo-Croatian epic, whose literary merits and significance, however, appear to be considerably lower than zero. The poems are thought to show traces of the development outlined; for example, the Muses are a disguise for the original poets who had lived through the events they describe; and 'fate' means the long-standing traditions which the later poets regretted their inability to alter.

Fränkel is not interested in the traces of physical speculation often cited from Homer. He looks rather for ways of thinking which reappeared in early philosophy: for example, the tendency 'to think in terms of forces and qualities' which accounts for personifications like Prayers, Ate, etc. Above all, he is interested in Homeric man. This being has powers of knowing (*φρένες*), of

insight (*vóos*), energy (*μένος*), moods and feelings (*θυμός*); but between these powers there is no conflict, though his ego can hold the last two in check. He is self-contained and single-minded. With him, to think is to act. Nor does the antithesis of ego and non-ego exist for him; he is at one with his world; he accepts even death with complete resignation. He is without hidden motives; he *is* as he acts; and hence fixed epithets are fitly used of him.

The oddities of Epic man, here doubtless exaggerated, begin to disappear in the *Odyssey*, where he develops more initiative and becomes less transparent. The much later syndicate to which we owe this poem recognized new virtues, such as kindness, and new characters, such as beggars. It could also descend to unromantic (though expressive) vulgarity, as in mentioning the black pudding in *xx. 25*. (The vulgar flies in *Il. xvi. 641* or *xvii. 570* apparently satisfy the author's standard of refinement.) The story is said to contain elements of sun-myth; that is why it is localized in an unimportant western island. The heroes of the *Iliad* too have some kinship with the sun; but this is not explained or argued in detail. Modernization has set in, however; Odyssean man is beginning to get a new structure. *Od. xviii. 136-7* anticipates Archilochus, with whom man no longer *is* what he *does* but *is*, or becomes, what his 'day', the present conditions of his life, *does to him*; and the meaning of *ἐφήμερος* is, rather fancifully as it seems to me, taken to be 'subject to the day' in this sense.

The history of philosophy begins with Hesiod, who expressed 'profound ontological speculation' in his doctrine of a chaos or empty space into which 'things' enter. This is taken as an analysis of the structure of the world into Being and Not-being. Similarly Night, as the mother of misery, is identified with 'the metaphysical principle of the Negative'. There is excellent, and much less abstruse, treatment of other Hesiodic concepts (*θέμις*, etc.). The criticism of Epic in *Theog. 22 ff.* is quoted, but its significance is not discussed. The lyric and elegiac poets show an increase in reflectiveness and self-consciousness, though, to begin with, their egoism is not to be overestimated: 'I' often means 'men in general'. Archilochus led the reaction against Epic. With him the Archaic period really begins. He threw away his shield in protest against Achilles' sense of honour; and he preferred his warriors to be bandy-legged. There is some over-interpretation here, as in the suggestion that Archilochus found in *Od. xviii. 130-1* the doctrine that all animals have a fixed character but man has not. Unlike Hesiod, Archilochus assumed in his fables that morality holds good for beasts also. Sappho's remains are nicely worked together into a connected series of appreciations. In declaring that the most beautiful thing is that which each holds dear she forestalled Protagoras' dictum, understood in the subjectivist and individualist sense.

But soon the old vitality grows weak. Semonides knows nothing of the pride of high endeavour. Unoriginal as he was, he nevertheless foreshadowed at least one philosophic idea, that qualities are grounded in the stuff of which things are made. For some of his women are not merely *like* various animals but *made out of* them. Others are made of earth or sea; and this notion is akin to the water of Thales and the earth and water of Xenophanes. Such poetry is becoming grotesque; it is descending to the trivial, and with Hipponax it sinks to mere entertainment-literature. Nor is the earnestness of Solon sufficient to make him either philosopher or poet. In such verse Fränkel misses the sense of mysterious heights and depths which he finds in the Hellenistic period. Archaic poetry has, for him, come to a dead end in the middle of the sixth

century. But it revives with Simonides and reaches its fulfilment in that thoroughly archaic man, Pindar. Choral lyric (Stesichorus, Ibycus) seems unaccountably to bridge this gap. But Ibycus already shows a sense of organic unity which presages the end of archaism and the beginning of classicism. On Pindar Fränkel has much to say, and the influence of Dornseiff is clearly present. I note that he finds Heraclitean ideas in *Ol.* 1. 1 ff.; that he takes the nectar of *Ol.* 7. 7 to mean immortality; and that the Muse may on occasion mean the manuscript of the ode. For Pindar's religious beliefs no use is made of *Ol.* 2. Pindar's unifying feature is held to be his conception of the unity of all values or excellences; and his method is to string together examples of this concrete universal. He personified excellence as *Θεία*, mother of the sun, in *Isthm.* 5. 1, taking the name from Hesiod. This is regarded as an anticipation of Plato's ideal theory in which also the Form of Good is parent of the sun. In general, the archaic period in literature is marked by 'polarity' in its way of thinking—Heraclitus most fully expressed this tendency—and, in its form, by the strung-along style. It lived its own life and thought its own thoughts; it is to be studied for its own sake and not as a preparation for the classical age, which rather violently reformed, or discarded, the old methods and the old values.

Of the philosophers from the Ionians onwards Fränkel gives interesting accounts, boldly translating their doctrines into more modern philosophic language. He will have nothing to do with the spatial interpretations, unfortunately current in this country, of Anaximander's *ἄπειρον* or Heraclitus' *λόγος*. He is excessively cautious on the Pythagoreans, not even mentioning their dualism, so that Parmenides' 'two-headed men' lack historical reference. But he is certainly right in stressing the fact that Parmenides never called his One a sphere; he merely said that it *resembled* a sphere in a certain well-defined way.

Since some of the points which I have summarized may appear more extravagant than they are in their context, it should be made clear that the merits of the book are independent of the reader's agreement with particular interpretations or generalizations. Though not exhaustive—there seems, for example, to be nothing about the doctrines of *ἕβρις*—the wealth of material presented and the quality of the presentation make this a very valuable book.

University of Sheffield

J. TATE

THE MILITARY VOCABULARY OF GREEK EPIC

HANS TRÜMPY: *Kriegerische Fachausdrücke im griechischen Epos*. Untersuchungen zum Wortschatze Homers. Pp. xii + 290. Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1950. Paper:

THIS review of a book which seems to have been published towards the end of 1950 or early in 1951 is regrettably late in appearing; but the fault is only in part the reviewer's (who now apologizes for his share in the delay), since it was not until the summer of 1952 that the editors received a review copy from the publishers, with a note that the book was 'just out of press'. It seems, indeed, that Trümpy's work has long been dogged by a delaying spirit: composed

during the late war, it was submitted to the University of Basel as a doctoral dissertation in 1945, and was ready for press in 1947, but had to wait some three years for publication. Thus it is not surprising that it is only in a series of 'Nachträge' (pp. 281-4) that Trümpy has been able to take account of such important publications as the articles by Miss Lorimer on the hoplite phalanx (*B.S.A.* xlii [1947], 76 ff.) and Miss Gray (to whom Trümpy, not altogether excusably, refers as *ihn*) on 'Homeric Epithets for Things' (*C.Q.* xli [1947], 109 ff.) and M. Leumann's *Homerische Wörter* (1950). On the other hand, the delay in publishing Trümpy's work has deprived scholars of most valuable assistance: to quote but two examples, the chapter on arms and armour in Miss Lorimer's *Homer and the Monuments* and Professor Page's discussion of μάχονται in *Alcm.* i. 63 (*Alcman, The Partheneion* [1951], 54-55; cf. *C.R.*, n.s. iii [1953], 17) would have benefited enormously from Trümpy's collection of the facts and from his very sensible comments.

Dr. Trümpy is a pupil of Professor von der Mühll, and acknowledges help from several scholars, including Professors Debrunner and Schefold. His work is thus firmly based, alike in Homeric scholarship, in philology, and in archaeology. These three disciplines he has combined in a thorough investigation of Homeric terminology in most of the main fields of military activity. The main headings of this study are: 'Die Waffen bei Homer und ihre Bezeichnungen' (pp. 6-89, with sections on body-armour, greaves, shields, the helmet, spears, swords, bow and arrow), 'Die Verwendung der Offensivwaffen' (90-121, including sections on 'Eminus' and 'Comminus'), 'Kämpfen und Kampf' (122-75), 'Krieger, Soldat' (176-80), '"Außenpolitische" Termini' (181-91, with sections on enemies, peace, and treaty-procedure), 'Sieg' (192-211), and 'Flucht' (212-33). A very good short-title bibliography and some 'Vorbemerkungen' precede, and a summary ('Grundsätzliches'—234-40) and notes (241-80) follow, the main part of the book. There are two indexes: a short one on style and subject-matter, and a longer one of the principal Greek words discussed.

The method and value of this study can perhaps be shown best by describing the section on shields (pp. 20-39). After a short paragraph on the archaeological data (an excellent summary, with sufficient bibliography), Trümpy goes on to a detailed study of the two most important words for 'shield', ἀσπίς and σάκος. He first gives figures for the appearance of these words in *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, *Hymns* (a 'nil' return), and Hesiod (only in the *Shield*), and lists all the epithets for each, with references and the name of the hero concerned. The Homeric evidence for the physical appearance of shields called ἀσπίς or σάκος is then assembled, with the conclusion that there is no hope of confining either word to a single type of shield. Next, Trümpy considers the derivatives, then the later history of ἀσπίς and σάκος and their etymology; after which he gives a most illuminating table of heroes and their shields (e.g. Achilles has an ἀσπίς once, a σάκος 17 times, Telamonian Ajax never an ἀσπίς, Aeneas, Agamemnon, and Hector never a σάκος). Then comes 'Schild und Panzer', with a table of the heroes who combine an ἀσπίς or a σάκος with a θώραξ. A consideration of the relative age of the two words leads to the conclusion that σάκος is already a poetical survival, whereas ἀσπίς belongs to everyday speech (in which it probably denoted the round shield). Summing up, Trümpy points out that Homer uses the everyday word with inconsistent epithets as a matter of poetic convenience (an argument which he could have made much stronger if he had

studied the works of Milman Parry), and ends with these notable words: 'In general, we must observe . . . that, in all matters of shields and body-armour, the *Odyssey* gives a more archaic impression than the *Iliad*.' Finally, about four pages are devoted to the other Homeric words for 'shield'.

This is a painstaking, thorough, and most valuable work, so far as it goes, and the almost excessive modesty of the author's claims (see especially pp. 234-9) makes it impossible to complain that this or that has been omitted. It must, however, be said (as has been hinted above) that the author's neglect of Milman Parry's work is a fundamental weakness in his study as a whole; and, in matters of detail, we have a right to complain of the author's really revolting predilection for what I may call the 'argumentative' use of the note of exclamation, and of the inexcusable inaccuracy of his references to, and quotations from, works written in English (this inaccuracy is now almost common form upon the Continent, apart from the Netherlands and Scandinavia). All in all, we may hope that Trümpy, or someone inspired by him, may go on to fill in the gaps in our understanding of Homer's technical vocabularies: in the military sphere, Trümpy himself mentions *Beute* and *töten*, and Delebecque's *lexique raisonné* of the horse in Homer (cf. *C.R.*, N.S. ii [1952], 149-51) would provide a foundation for another study like Trümpy's—and then, there are always ships, houses, and the arts and crafts to be going on with.

University of Leeds

J. A. DAVISON

SOPHOCLES

CEDRIC H. WHITMAN: *Sophocles. A Study of Heroic Humanism*. Pp. 292. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Cloth, 31s. 6d. net.

A. J. A. WALDOCK: *Sophocles the Dramatist*. Pp. viii+234. Cambridge: University Press, 1951. Cloth, 16s. net.

IVAN M. LINFORTH: *Religion and Drama in 'Oedipus at Colonus'*. (Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 14, No. 4.) Pp. 118. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951. Paper, \$1.25.

ROBERT F. GOHEEN: *The Imagery of Sophocles' Antigone*. A Study of Poetic Language and Structure. Pp. 171. Princeton: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Cloth, 20s. net.

'ATHENS might rock on her foundations with debates about the existence or meaning of the gods, but no one had as yet questioned the value or dignity of man.' This seems a very fair expression of the Greek fifth century; and to Professor Whitman, Sophocles is no serene occupant of an ivory tower, but the very incarnation of the spirit. In contrast alike with Aeschylus and with Euripides, he reposes a faith in man which he cannot bestow upon the gods—there are qualities in man which amount to 'a kind of divinity'. This immortal ἀρετή, familiar from sepulchral epigrams and pronouncements, is found above all in the Sophoclean hero. He has two salient characteristics—self-destructiveness and intimacy with the gods. He follows his guiding star of ἀρετή; he exalts himself towards Heaven; and he thereby renders himself unfit for this dull

earth. He destroys himself because of his excellence, not in spite of it. He is subjected to severe criticism from the other characters and from the chorus; but this represents the judgement of ordinary people. Notions of *σωφροσύνη* and *μηδὲν ἄγαν* are adapted to the many; *γνώθι σεαυτόν*, on the other hand, is the prerogative of the *μεγαλόψυχος* who rises above the transient and empirical. He knows what is right, and the opinions of lesser men are of small consequence.

Whitman divides the seven plays into three groups. *Ajax* and *Antigone* are studies in tragic *ἀρετή*; *Trachiniae* and *O.T.* in tragic knowledge; *Electra*, *Philoctetes*, and *O.C.* in tragic *τλημοσύνη*. Ajax 'understands his duty to himself'; he cannot compromise or submit. Whitman provides an impressive interpretation of the famous 'yielding' speech. Antigone understands her duty to 'real authority'. Deianira and Oedipus seek and find themselves, and 'take the consequences of self-knowledge'. Electra and Philoctetes, by virtue of their *τλημοσύνη*, 'live through the problem of living amid the abuses of the world and society'. Ajax and Antigone leave an afterglow; the total destruction of Deianira and Oedipus marks a period of depression. Electra, Philoctetes, and Oedipus at the last, arise superior to the uses of this world. Whitman is particularly ingenious in his dealings with Electra and Philoctetes. The bright Orestes he regards as a *deus ex machina*, symbolizing Electra's triumph over adversity. Heracles with his immortal *ἀρετή* is essentially a projection of Philoctetes' heroic self; his appearance signifies that Philoctetes has triumphed alike over guile and force and persuasion; he may now fulfil his destiny of his own volition. Finally, in the *Coloneus*, Oedipus attains to human apotheosis. In a concluding chapter Whitman describes the interaction of the human and moral divinity with the nebulous and non-moral power which directs the universe.

Many criticisms could be advanced. P. 93: This discussion, like many another, of the Herodotean lines is inadequate. The arguments of Kitto, Powell, Wycherley (*C.P.* xlii, p. 51), and Sheppard are neglected. It is true that Antigone's intellectual limitations have no bearing on her moral grandeur; but they should be frankly acknowledged. P. 125: At *O.T.* 8, *καλούμενος* might perhaps be construed with *πᾶσι*, 'I whom all men hail as "Famous Oedipus".' The king wishes to affirm his fame and his affability at once. P. 235: *H.F.* 342 is spoken not by 'Heracles, crushed amid the ruins of his life' but by Amphitryon before the hero's entry. P. 281, n. 29: Whitman appears to me to assume that Gorgias uses *πόθος* in the subjective sense of 'longing'; surely it bears the objective sense 'appeal', just as *ἕμερος* can mean 'loveliness' (*Ant.* 795), and *ἔρως* 'object of love'. Whitman argues cogently against the general theory of *ἁμαρτία*, but he seems on occasion to overstate his case. Creon, we are told (p. 28), is the villain of the *Antigone*, and cannot be regarded as the *hamartia* focus. The description is surely exaggerated; and, although Antigone is the more commanding figure, the fact remains that Creon's part is half as long again. Deianira's *hamartia*, we are told (p. 114), is of an intellectualistic sort. This is very naïve. She takes an outrageous risk; she is morally at fault in allowing herself to think it justifiable. It is hardly fair to say (p. 204) that 'Laius had hit Oedipus over the head with an ox-goad, for no reason other than that he was in the way'. His reason was that Oedipus had struck (perhaps killed) his herald. The Athenian audience would bear in mind that it is easier for a man than for a chariot to get off a path; they would draw the impression that Oedipus' temper had got him into trouble within a very short while of the

oracle's warning. Their impression would harmonize with Creon's verdict at *O.T.* 674 and *O.C.* 835. We are told (p. 156) that 'Electra is victorious in the end, and there is no trace of her harshness being punished'. This scarcely does justice, e.g. to Sheppard's writings on the subject; *C.R.* xli, p. 2 (mentioned on p. 271) should be supplemented with *C.Q.* xii, p. 80. P. 255, n. 48: Whitman writes to say that ἀτασθαλία was listed among Aeschylean words by an oversight.

Nevertheless, this is a fine book—original and stimulating in the highest degree. The integration of Sophocles's thought into that of his time is most impressive; and the study of heroic characterization in the individual plays is fully adequate to account for their splendour. The fact that Whitman does less than justice perhaps to other theses does not invalidate his own, and no one can read his book without deriving the greatest profit from it.

Professor Waldock's approach to Sophocles is more akin to that of the younger Wilamowitz. Sophocles to him is essentially a dramatic artist, and should not be scrutinized too closely for deeper meaning. A dramatist is obliged to write for immediate impression; whatever he chooses to conceal may never be found. Waldock begins with a general discussion of some aspects of dramatic criticism. The historical method has its uses; but the essential background can be easily acquired; there is a danger that our minds may become so congested with dubious parallels that we may miss the point which on any given occasion is being made. Our attention is drawn to what Waldock neatly calls the documentary fallacy—the assumption that in drama as in life the least phenomena depend on a chain of causation which it may be necessary to investigate. In fact, a play is designed to convey one major impression in the simplest way. We are warned against pattern-making and advised that every play has its own particular function. A discussion of catharsis is appended. Waldock then examines the individual plays. He devotes much space to refuting theories concerning them. On the positive side, he demonstrates the dramatic necessity of certain features, and describes the general impression of the plays.

Waldock's style is vigorous and attractive. He makes a number of trenchant observations, which are reasonable in themselves and of value to anyone to whom they have not already occurred. But I fancy the generality of scholars are less easily imposed upon than he assumes; and, on the other hand, there is more scope for research and imagination than he admits. Waldock would probably have agreed that his positive results are a little disappointing—*Trachiniae* 'high melodrama', *Antigone* 'romantic tragedy', *O.T.* 'an epigram in ill-luck'. I think he fails to allow for two factors which justify us in pursuing the deeper meaning. The first is that indications which to us are faint may have been apparent to the original audience. Common sense is indispensable, but only an immensity of learning can enable us to make common-sense judgements of the fifth century. The second is that the dramatists assuredly worked above all for the first production; in collaboration with the actors they would produce effects which we can only conjecture. It would be a pity if scholars ever lost faith in the value of discriminating research. Waldock was unhappy, I think, in his experience of theorists; the 'double burial' in the *Antigone* has been far better explained by Sheppard (*Wisdom of Sophocles*, p. 51) than by the critic he censures on p. 126; and Wycherley and others have excellently expounded the Herodotean lines.

Professor Waldock died shortly after finishing the manuscript of his book, and slight deficiencies of presentation are only to be expected. Long quotations are found where a mere reference would suffice. In sum, he has left us a forceful and very readable presentation of certain aspects of dramatic criticism. It remains true, to quote Professor Whitman, that 'Supreme dramatic art means the ability to fit together the technical necessities and the poetic intention.'

Professor Linforth discusses the religious content of the *O.C.*; and considers its relation to the dramatic structure. He concludes that we should take it at its face value; but that it is definitely of secondary importance; oracles and apotheosis are the raw materials of a great character-drama. I advance the following criticisms. P. 96: ἀμαιμακείται is wrongly accented oxytone; the word may be obscure to us; but was it obscure to the original audience? P. 100, n. 19: Linforth is unwise to adduce the end of *I.A.* P. 178: Antigone and Ismene naturally return to the Chorus for comfort. Linforth is to be congratulated, however, for his note on νήφων (p. 93), and for his appendix on vv. 1565-7 (p. 187). The book makes no particular claim to originality, but strikes one as thoroughly sound.

Professor Goheen applies himself to the much neglected study of imagery. In ch. 2, 'Evaluation and Control', he shows how the receptive mind is turned against Creon by contemplation of image sequences. The money sequence is manipulated to show the inadequacy of his assessments of motive; the military sequence to show the despotic nature of his power. Animal imagery conveys that Creon deals with his fellow men as though he were a god. In ch. 3 the larger perspective is similarly treated. Death the bridal affords a symbolic consummation. Disease imagery reflects the contagion of sin and folly. The metaphors of sailing and the sea reflect as always the perils of navigation through life. In ch. 5, the intuitive perception of Antigone and the intellectual pretensions of Creon are considered; the imagery of sight is shown to comment on Creon's limitations. The book ends with a disappointing postscript.

On p. 45 the sense of εἴπερ ἤδ' ὁμορροθεῖ will perhaps be 'If she is responsible (as she is), I am responsible too.' P. 65: Errandonea's theory of prophetic symbolism in the Danae chorus is most impressive. It looks as though Sophocles found the Cleopatra-Eurydice parallel attractive, and dragged in Megareus to make it exact. P. 78: Page and Powell have surely succeeded in showing that vv. 909-12 are indeed taken from Herodotus. But Goheen's treatment is the best yet. P. 107: κτείνειν νυμφεῖα involves a metaphorical use of νυμφεῖα, not of κτείνειν. The book is untidily turned out. Along with plenty of Greek type, we find whole sentences transliterated into English—a laborious procedure which breeds inaccuracy. Irritating misprints are found on p. 104 'ignis fatui', 146 'Baccyliides', 156 'Die Fragments'. The style of writing is unequal to the content. But it is a most valuable book. It is eminently sane in its conclusions; and it shows what a wealth of significance remains to be extracted from Greek literature by a study of imagery.

University College of North Wales, Bangor

A. D. FITTON BROWN

ΑΙΣΩΠΟΣ ΠΟΤ' ΕΛΕΕΕ

BEN EDWIN PERRY: *Aesopica*. A series of texts relating to Aesop or ascribed to him or closely connected with the literary tradition that bears his name. Vol. I: Greek and Latin Texts. Pp. xxiii+765. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1952. Cloth, \$15.

THIS large, solid, closely printed and, unfortunately but inevitably, expensive volume gives the public the first full and critical edition of Aesop that has ever existed. It is the fruit of over fifteen years' continual and minute labour; an earlier and much shorter work by the same author was reviewed in *C.R.* li. 147. Imposing though it is, it does not complete the author's task; vol. ii is to contain, as explained in the preface, some hundreds of Armenian fables in an English translation, 'systematic accounts' of sundry Oriental traditions, early and late, and a commentary. It is much to be hoped that the author will be able to fulfil his intentions in this matter, for there is much in the fables themselves and also in the *Life of Aesop* which calls for well-informed comment. When all is done, not only students of what may be perhaps called the sub-literary activities of antiquity but also folklorists will possess an unsurpassed tool for their respective branches of research. The book so far is written, save of course for the Greek texts, in clear and fluent Latin, only the preface being in English.

Its contents are as follows. After the preface we are given in full the two principal texts of the *Life*, lettered respectively G and W. The former, which is much the longer (e.g., the episodes which, in W, occupy 16 lines on p. 83 fill 42 in G on pp. 39-40), has claims to go back to an original as early as the first century of our era. It is in part a rather clumsy adaptation of the adventures of Ahikar (pp. 6-11 give a detailed comparison), and is the source of some of the best-known traditions concerning Aesop, especially his extraordinary ugliness, which no earlier author has ever heard of. Perry claims that it is the work of a Greek-speaking Egyptian, not well educated and irritated by the claims of the higher Greek culture, as represented in the *Life* by Aesop's master Xanthos and his pupils. I think the proof offered hardly suffices. Isis gives Aesop his wisdom, there is a certain hostility to Apollo, and the ruler of Egypt has a name, Nektanebo(s), not merely a title. But the scene is chiefly in Samos, Nektanebos gets very much the worse of an encounter with Aesop, who is acting on behalf of the king of Babylon, and the dislike of Apollo is surely justified by the fact that Aesop was murdered by the Delphians, the god doing nothing to prevent it. I do, on the other hand, detect a flavour of popular Cynicism, not only in the extreme rudeness of the hero towards his social superiors but in the more or less exact coincidence of at least two episodes with stories told of Diogenes (*Life G*, 65-66 Perry; cf. *Life W*, 11 Westermann, and *Diog. Laert.* vi. 41, the famous *ἀνθρῶπον ζητῶ*; *Diog. Laert.* vi. 52, Diogenes seeing a tree on which some women had hanged themselves wishes all trees bore such fruit, and in *Aesopi sententia* No. 20 Perry, p. 252, the same tale is told of Aesop). Be this as it may, the longer *Life* is preserved in one manuscript, G, in the Pierpont Morgan collection. W is so lettered from its being included in Westermann's collection of Greek biographies (1845), and besides being shorter omits Isis altogether and is in less bad Greek. Perry gives it a

full and elaborate apparatus criticus from a group of manuscripts which he has studied carefully.

After the Lives come first all the *testimonia* the editor can find (105, including some of the shorter Lives); next, the sayings (*sententiae*) with which Aesop is credited in sundry ancient and medieval authors; then some 200 proverbs attributed to him. The Fables themselves occupy pp. 295–711 of the book and those in Greek amount in all to 471 (in Chambry's edition, of which Perry speaks highly, dismissing Halm as scissors and paste, there are 359). The total is made up as follows. First comes the principal prose collection, the Augustana (so named from its preservation in the cod. Augustanus, now Monacensis 564). On this follow all fables not contained in the Augustana but found either in one of the lesser collections of prose fables or somewhere in Greek literature, from Hesiod onwards. Mere variants of each fable, such as are to be found printed in full in Chambry, are omitted. After these texts, to which is subjoined as a sort of appendix the Greek version of the Syriac collection of the so-called Syntipas, come those Latin ones of which no Greek form is known. Here, we have simply excerpts from good editions of such authors as Phaedrus and Avianus, with no original examination of the manuscript tradition or critical recension such as Perry gives to the Greek fables. The selections extend to medieval literature, and rightly, for that contains among other matters not found in Greek so well-known a story as the mice seeking to bell the cat and the little tale from which comes the proverb 'Out of the frying-pan into the fire'. Full indexes give not only a guide to the actual fables but alphabetical lists of incidents and themes contained in them, also to the proper names which occur.

Inevitably, in so long a book there are details with which one may find fault. To list them here would take too much space, and they are of no great importance. Misprints are rare and trifling. An omission seems to be the fable concerning Prometheus told by Horace, *Odes* i. 16. 13–16. Some of the so-called fables included do not appear to me to be such; one item (No. 489, from Phaedrus ii. 5) is an anecdote current in that writer's own day, and several, while genuine folk-tales, are not of the Aesopic type. On pp. 503 and 504 the name of Plutarch should be in square brackets.

University of St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

THE SOPHISTS

EUGÈNE DUPRÉEL: *Les Sophistes—Protagoras, Gorgias, Prodicus, Hippias*. Pp. 407. Neuchâtel: Editions du Griffon, 1948. Paper, 25 Sw. fr.

THIS work, by the author of *La Légende Socratique et les Sources de Platon*, combines four monographs. That on Hippias occupies 220 pages, while the other three together occupy only 180. Nevertheless the earlier three are the more valuable, since each has some serious discussion of important evidence for the sophist concerned. On the *Homo Mensura* doctrine there is serious (if not very convincing) argument that the 'sociological' meaning is so primary that epistemological considerations were virtually imported by Plato and Sextus. In the case of Gorgias there is a good discussion of the traditions concerning the *περὶ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος* in the *de M.X.G.* and in Sextus. There are three useful pages of summing-up concerning Prodicus.

For the rest we have an amazing review of some of the dialogues of Plato with special reference to the Platonic apocrypha, with occasional references to the *δισσοὶ λόγοι* (these references are the most relevant) and to the Xenophontic writings. Dupréel seeks to establish that the passages cited are primary evidence for the Sophists' writings and teachings. Clearly the *Hippias* dialogues, the *Protagoras* and *Theaetetus*, the *Gorgias*, and the direct references to Prodicus in Plato and Xenophon are of first-rate importance; but it is surely absurd to argue that we shall find direct reminiscences of fifth-century sophists in late fourth-century writers on commonplace themes; and nowhere is it more absurd than in the long attempt to construct a positive philosophy of Hippias out of such 'reminiscences'. An example may be given. At Plato, *Politicus* 275 d, the Eleatic Stranger says that the Statesman eluded capture in the earlier defining-process 'when it came to our finding names for classes' (κατὰ τὴν ὀνομασίαν). Diès notes in his translation that Plato uses ὀνομασία only here and that it is also found in the title of one of Hippias' works, ἐθνῶν ὀνομασία. Therefore, Dupréel argues (p. 235), Plato is consciously following Hippias in the whole thought of the passage—and indeed the whole dialogue is only a working out of Hippias' philosophy according to Dupréel (p. 230). But Diès was only citing a previous use of the word ὀνομασία. There is no reason at all to suppose that Hippias meant more than 'nomenclature', a sophist's improvement on ὀνόματα, 'names'. Plato, however, clearly uses the word carefully as the noun describing the act of ὀνομάζειν, even if he gives a humorous side-glance at Hippias in the usage. Here perhaps Diès gave Dupréel some excuse: usually there is less excuse for his 'parallels'. For instance, a sermon in the *First Alcibiades* 'clearly betrays the stern author of the *Heracles*'. Does it? And was Prodicus really the author or only the improver of the *Heracles*? Yet the discussion here of the *First Alcibiades* itself is serious and balanced. The best feature of the book is its analysis and discussion of the doubtful and spurious Platonic dialogues. Anyone concerned with the Platonic apocrypha—an unduly neglected field—would find considerable help and suggestion here. Perhaps this compensates for the lack of any convincing additions to our knowledge of the Sophists. If the title of the work had been *The Platonic Apocrypha* one could have been more appreciative.

University of Durham

J. B. SKEMP

PLATO'S TELEOLOGY

JOHANNES HUBERTUS MATHIAS MARIE LOENEN: *De nous in het systeem van Plato's filosofie*. Pp. viii+297. Amsterdam: Jasonpers, 1951. Paper.

LOENEN's grasp of the nature of the evidence enables him to give, in my opinion, a juster version of Platonism than many modern exponents of the texts have produced. Every interpretation is, whether this is admitted or not, a work of 'reconstruction'. Loenen sees that this is inevitable, and that if one is to ascribe to Plato a doctrine which is really *thinkable*, one must try to bring out what Plato left 'implicit' in the dialogues. He expressly adopts Robin's postulate that Plato was at least striving after a systematization of his reflections. Though I should disagree with a number of his conclusions, his point of view which I

have tried to indicate, and his constant effort to verify his interpretations by strictly textual methods, have enabled him to achieve a good measure of success in the present work.

Loenen seeks to trace the development of Plato's doctrine that the cause of the order of the visible is a cosmic intellect possessed of knowledge of the good. He holds that when Plato wrote *Phaedo* he had as yet no such theory and indeed 'rejected' the doctrine of a world-mind which he 'mistakenly' attributed to Anaxagoras, who used *νοῦς* in the 'Ionic' sense of *ψυχή* and made it his principle of movement rather than of order. Our authorities from Plato onwards, it seems to me, are against this view of Anaxagoras' doctrine. Nor do I find teleology rejected in *Phaedo*; the Forms are final causes after which their particulars 'strive', and 'Socrates' merely complains that Anaxagoras did not help him to take the next step towards a complete doctrine of teleology, the step of showing that all things, both Forms and particulars, are dominated by the right and the good. He does not 'reject' that step as impossible or undesirable. However, Loenen's main thesis merely requires the less violent deduction that Plato's teleology necessarily remained incomplete until he had mitigated his 'body-soul dualism' sufficiently to formulate the doctrine of a world-soul which *moves* as well as thinks. He finds soul as a principle of movement first in *Phaedrus*; but it was not until *Philebus* that Plato thought of locating *νοῦς*, as a teleological principle, in the moving world-soul; and so the doctrine became at last full-fledged. Meanwhile, from *Soph.* onwards, he had been developing the view of *νοῦς* as a 'function' of the cosmic soul. Loenen deduces from the five-times-repeated dictum 'no mind without a soul' that there is no *νοῦς χωριστός* in Plato. Plato's supreme principle is not *νοῦς*, and the passages quoted in favour of an Absolute Mind (*Phileb.* 22 c, 30 c, among others) really refer to mind not as a substance but as an attribute of the world-soul. In the human soul also *νοῦς* is not a 'part' but a 'function'; it is not *τὸ λογιστικόν*. I find this argument indecisive if only because the 'parts' of the soul in Plato can very well be understood not as physical parts but as different functions or powers of an incomposite unity.

The world-soul is not Plato's supreme principle. In the background there is a 'transcendent' and 'ineffable' reality which is the Form of Good and creator of Forms in *Rep.*, the Demiurge in *Tim.* (who is the personification not of *νοῦς*, as Hackforth argued, but of the Good), the *θεὸς δημιουργῶν* of *Soph.* 265 c, the God of the *Politicus* myth, and the draughts-player and sovereign of *Laws* 903-4. Except for the last-mentioned passage Loenen finds the transcendent God absent from *Laws*. Following England and Hackforth he translates *τὴν ἀριστὴν ψυχὴν* as 'the best kind of soul' in 896 c 7 and 898 c 4. He has not observed that 898 c 6-8 is against this translation: Cleinias in summing up this section of the argument speaks of 'one soul or more than one, possessed of all goodness', not of 'one kind of soul or', etc. Loenen has the merit of recognizing the mythical character of *Tim.*; the Demiurge is described in 'anthropomorphic' terms, and his passive relation to the Forms is just one of the mythical features in the description. As ineffable, Loenen argues, he is not a soul; and the Forms were probably, in Plato's unexpressed thought, 'emanations' from the supreme principle.

Loenen is at his least convincing when he holds that from *Soph.* onwards there are Forms of 'concrete substances' only; and that the doctrine of evil souls in *Laws* x is unplatonic, being introduced there as 'easier' for the masses

to understand than the 'explanation' of evil found in *Tim.* A deeper analysis might well succeed in reconciling these two partial solutions of the problem of evil.

University of Sheffield

J. TATE

A NEW EDITION OF THUCYDIDES I

ANTONIO MADDALENA: *Thucydidis Historiarum liber primus*. Introduzione, testo critico e commento con traduzione e indici. 3 vols. Pp. lxxxv+95, 259, 181. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1951, 1952. Paper, L.1300.

THESE three volumes (which are nos. 15, 18, and 20 of the 'Biblioteca di Studi Superiori') contain a lengthy introduction on *la questione* and a commentary on cc. 1-23 in the first, and the rest of the commentary and the translation of Book i in the second and third. There is no preface, so that we do not know whether Dr. Maddalena intends to continue with the rest of Thucydides (before this book his principal publications were in other fields, and varied enough), nor the precise scope and plan of the present work; only the publisher's note tells us that he has attempted to give a lucid interpretation of the text, to show the logical connexion between one part and another, and to clarify the historiographical problems which Thucydides' narrative poses to the modern reader: to this end, though the critical apparatus is reduced to a minimum, reasons are always given for the choice of one manuscript reading or emendation rather than another.

The apparatus is not only slight, but appears to be taken direct from Hude or Stuart Jones-Powell; that is, there are no signs of any independent examination of manuscripts, only a half-page of introductory note, of a quite conventional character, on the two groups of medieval manuscripts, with nothing on the papyri, and where the apparatus differs from Powell's, it seems only to do so by mistake, through following Hude: e.g. 80. 3 'prius τοὺς om. CG' (so Hude; C only according to Powell); 95. 1 'γίγνεσθαι C' (for 'CG'); 98. 4 'ἐκάσθη A' (for 'codd. '); 125. 2 ('ὁμοίως M'), 126. 11 and 144. 2 are similar and all involve readings of M. At 49. 7, ἐγίγνετο C (G) : ἐγένετο cett. [*Π*²⁸], Maddalena says that the latter 'sembra confermata da *Π*²⁸', but not that he has examined the papyrus fragment, or a facsimile, himself; at 34. 2 he has a longish note on the variant readings of subjunctive and indicative, but does not record a similar variation at 56. 2, which affects the value of his argument. His notes on readings and emendations are in general sensible, with very little that is original—generally a choice between Krüger or Stahl, Classen or Steup or Croiset—but perhaps none the worse for that; but he confuses the problems, both of idiom and sense, at 37. 2 and 69. 2, perversely reads εἰ . . . ἀποκωλύη at 72. 2 (-οι CG: -ει F) as *lectio difficilior*, and though at times wondering how words can have been wrongly inserted in the text, proposes, without any probability, to bracket ἡ γνώμη ἡ δυνάμει τῇ διὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ ὅπως οὖν at 77. 3, and all of 96. 2 (after Classen, but for different reasons). At 126. 6 he suggests, with some ingenuity, that Thucydides wrote πανδημεὶ θύουσι ἱερεῖα, to which was added a scholion in the margin, πολλοὶ οὐχ ἱερεῖα ἀλλὰ (or ἀλλ' ἄγνα),

θύματα ἐπιχώρια, though admittedly the text must have been corrupted before Pollux.

There are very few notes on grammar as such—none for example on τοῦ μή τινα ζητῆσαι, 23. 6, μηδὲ δυοῖν φθάσαι ἀμάρτωσιν, 33. 3, or τὸ δεδιδὸς αὐτοῦ, 36. 1, and an inadequate one on πολεμήσαντα, 110. 1 (but, surprisingly, there is one on ὄθεν, 89. 3)—or on style. Such matters are only touched on if a reading is in question.

The notes are very long: about 6 to 8 lines of text per page to over 30 of comment), every passage is either translated or analysed, many are both. In the translation proper a great deal of what has been done already is repeated, with variations; and while the method of fusing translation and comment may have some advantages, it is irritating for the scholar to have such lengthy notes where the text is simple and clear, and, I should have thought, not really useful to the student, who might do a little work for himself. It will be fairest if I give an example, the note on 28. 2—to save space, it will be one of Maddalena's shortest notes:

εἰ δέ τι . . . ἐπιτρέψαι. Due sono le proposte dei Corciresi, nel caso che Corinto in qualche modo rivendichi Epidamno (εἰ δέ τι ἀντιποιοῦνται, sc. τῆς Ἐπιδάμνου): che Corciresi e Corinzi si sottopongano a un arbitro presso città scelte di comune accordo (l'*ais* dipende da un *pará* che si recava dal *pará póleuan*), impegnandosi a lasciare autorità su Epidamno (*κρατεῖν*) a coloro ai quali gli arbitri attribuissero la colonia; o che (*ἤθελον δὲ καί*, erano anche disposti) si affidi il giudizio all' oracolo di Delfo.

In the translation, the rendering is neater, but adds nothing to this; it is a quite unnecessary note; and it is one of very many. Where the logical connexion, or the grammatical structure, in Thucydides is less clear, e.g. 35. 3, 36. 1, 77. 3–5, the notes are longer (but at the difficult 138. 3, we need more), but more useful, though there is little that is novel.

The historical notes, on the other hand, are very inadequate. I may be prejudiced in this; and it is wrong to criticize a man for not doing what he has not set out to do; but I should suppose that any commentary on Thucydides, certainly one that aims at throwing light on historiographical problems, should have had notes to explain how far our other evidence supports both the particular statements and the general treatment of past history in cc. 1–21, others on the geographical and other problems of the battle of Sybota, and one on the 460 talents tribute in 96. 2 saying more than that Classen thought the figures inexact. On the Athenian generals in the Corcyra campaign Maddalena does not refer to the inscription which confirms the first three (45. 2) and, though he refers to it (as *C.I.A.* i. 179) to note the difficulty in the second list (51. 4), he only does so to say that there were three generals, not two, and that Andocides is a mistake for (probably) Dracontides—a manuscript error, he thinks—without giving any reference to Stahl's article, or to a summary of it, which makes that view probable. (But for the dates of the Potidaea campaign he does quote an inscription rightly—*I.G.* i.² 296—and gives a reference to other opinion which he follows.) On the chronology of the *pentekontaetia* he only gives a number of what he thinks to be probable dates without referring to more thorough discussions elsewhere. On 93. 2 he has no archaeological note, and misinterprets δῆλη . . . ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐστίν, through not observing that, as far as we know, the city-wall of Athens was not destroyed in 404. On 101. 2 his note on Diodorus' and Plutarch's evidence is misleading (and there is an error in the statement that Diodorus puts the earthquake at Sparta in 476–475).

At 103. 1 he keeps *δεκάτω ἔτει* as what Thucydides wrote, because Diodorus has the same figure (no word about the confusion in *his* account); he thinks that Thucydides here deserted chronological order, but was mistaken in his figure; and himself would put the end of the Helot war in 459, following the majority of scholars, very nearly where it would be in Thucydides' narrative if he was keeping to chronological order and wrote *ἐκτώ ἔτει*—not quite, because Maddalena says that 'probably' Athens attacked Egypt while Sparta was engaged in besieging Ithome (with another reference to *C.I.A.* instead of *I.G.* i¹). At 117. 2-3 there are references to Androtion, to Nepos and Diodorus (not to Isocrates), and to *I.G.* i.² 293, but not, for example, to Wade-Gery's discussion. On 132. 2 the note is quite inadequate, that on 125. 2 better. On 137. 2 it is reasonable, but with no reference later than Busolt; on 138. 5 a modern theory (a correct one, in my belief) is stated as ascertained fact. Add to this that there is no bibliography, and that references to Plutarch and Diodorus are often given with no indication of book or chapter; and the same is true for references not only to standard histories, as to Beloch and Busolt, but even to separate books and articles, only the author's name, Schwartz or Kirchhoff or Pohlenz, being given—though, it is true, you may find the name in the first index with a reference to the introduction and *there* the name of the book; even then you would not know if the reference to Steup was to his edition or his *Studien*.

In a long comment on 77.1 (which again takes but little notice of other evidence, and in consequence misrepresents my view) Maddalena translates *ἐλασσοῦμενοι* 'usando della nostra forza meno di quanto potremmo', 'usando moderazione', because in the Athenian view ('which was also that of Thucydides') it would be contrary to nature for the stronger party to be any way worsted or at a disadvantage. This forced interpretation brings me to the subject of the long Introduction: *La Questione*, i.e. Thucydides' philosophy of history and his way of expressing it. After the usual analysis of other scholars' theories from Ullrich to our own day, which does not take account of any difference of approach to the subject in spite of a section called *il problema metodico*, he gives his own view: which is that Thucydides believed in the doctrine of force, that is, that it was inevitable that the stronger should command the weaker though this is in itself wrong, unjust; but, also, that he believed that the unity which the rule of one strong state over other weak ones produces is the cause of material progress and peace (though, awkwardly enough, when there are *two* powerful states war also is 'inevitable'), and, if the rule is moderate, this means that there is less injustice and misery in the world than there otherwise would be. This can be seen from Greek history, from the time of Minos to Thucydides' own day; and this is what the Athenians consistently argue—the ambassadors at Sparta in Book i, Pericles, Diodotus, the delegates at Melos (we are given a long analysis of the dialogue), Euphemus—'our rule means peace and justice to all who will take advantage of it and do not oppose our will', 'justice comes out of injustice' (how fortunately). Hence the weak are not only foolish but wrong to go to war against the strong, though this is perhaps not a good way to put it, for virtue is primarily an intellectual quality. Hence Chios was right (viii. 24. 4), Melos wrong; and we can see that this latter was Thucydides' own view because all the Athenian expectations expressed in the dialogue prove to be correct, all the Melian false. (Yet Maddalena believes that the dialogue was written after 404.)

Athens, on the other hand, was right to go to war, even though she was finally defeated, because, as Pericles, the ideal of intellectual ἀρετή, foresaw, she *ought*, with her advantages, to have won, and would have if she had not made so many foolish errors. This interpretation of Thucydides' thought turns up at every opportunity in the commentary as well: 1. 1 τεκμαιρόμενος, κ.τ.λ., means that Thucydides thought the spread of the war inevitable; 7. 1 ἰσχύος, 'è ancora notevole come T. colga la dialettica della forza che genera forza'; 98. 4 παρὰ τὸ καθεστῆκός—'lo scoliasta commenta: παρὰ τὸ νόμιμον καὶ πρέπον. Il παρὰ τὸ νόμιμον è esatto; il παρὰ τὸ πρέπον non risponde al pensiero di T.' We are left to wonder what Maddalena, if he is to edit the whole history, will make of the Plataean and Theban speeches in iii, of τὸ εὖθες in iii. 83. 1, of the praise of Nicias' ἀρετή, and, above all, of Brasidas and the revolts of Acanthus, Torone, and Scione, especially Scione. For, of course, this introduction is an appendix printed in the wrong place: it assumes a specialist's, not a student's, knowledge of Thucydides, and, what no one has, of Maddalena's own commentary. He gives his conclusions first, his evidence—a little of it, so far—afterwards.

University of Glasgow

A. W. GOMME

THE STYLE OF DEMOSTHENES

GILBERTE RONNET: *Étude sur le style de Démosthène dans les discours politiques*. Pp. 204. Paris: de Boccard, 1951. Paper.

DR. RONNET's purpose is to show that Demosthenes' style reflects not only the man himself but also the development of his character. 'Ce n'est donc pas seulement un portrait, mais une sorte de film de sa vie morale que Démosthène nous présente dans son style.' She confines her study to the political speeches and the two great politico-legal speeches, *On the Embassy* and *On the Crown*. Her method is to examine the stylistic qualities of individual speeches and from this evidence to trace the stages by which Demosthenes' style was formed and the corresponding stages in the development of his outlook and character.

The book is divided into five chapters. The first deals with vocabulary and syntax; the section headed 'Syntaxe' is not so comprehensive as the word suggests, being confined to Demosthenes' use of the substantival adjective, participle, and infinitive. The second treats word-order and verbal repetition. In the third the development of sentence-structure and the growth of the Demosthenic period are traced. The fourth analyses the occurrence of various 'figures of thought'—rhetorical questions, dialogue, apostrophe, etc., and the fifth deals with metaphor and simile. Probably wisely, the question of prose-rhythm and the statistical examination of syllable-length are avoided.

From this detailed analysis the following deductions are made. The first two speeches, *On the Symmories* and *For the Megalopolitans*, reveal the immature Demosthenes. In the former he tries, unsuccessfully, to produce an artistic effect by excessive use of hyperbaton and antithesis, and by a monotonous regularity in the structure of his sentences. In the latter, on the other hand, he aims at simplicity by avoiding stylistic ornament and studied structure, preferring long, formless sentences. In the speech *On the Liberty of the Rhodians* Demosthenes is pictured as groping to find the mean between these two

extremes. This is achieved in the *First Philippic*. Here, helped by the experience of his earlier experiments and inspired by passion for his cause, he produces a period which shows a happy alliance between symmetry and dissymmetry; monotony is avoided by varying the periodic structure with an accumulation of simple independent sentences or of co-ordinate clauses; colour is added by the free use of metaphors; rhetorical questions and apostrophe reflect the poise and self-confidence of the mature orator. Demosthenes' style has now found its basic form and its subsequent evolution is discussed in less detail, but Dr. Ronnet tries to show how the historical circumstances affected Demosthenes' outlook and how this in turn was reflected in the style of individual speeches.

The labour involved in compiling the statistics on which these deductions are based must have been formidable. The manner of their presentation is clear and methodical. In general the conclusions reached on Demosthenes' style are convincing. One feels doubtful, however, about the validity both of the statistical method used and of the inferences drawn from its data. It is an accepted principle of statistical research that its results are not a reliable guide unless they are based on a large number of instances. Many of these speeches are much too short to allow this method to be employed satisfactorily. An illustration of its shortcomings may be taken from the section on metaphor (p. 151). Dr. Ronnet reckons that the *Second Olynthiac* has 10 metaphors in 31 paragraphs and the *Third Olynthiac* 11 in 36 paragraphs; consequently the proportion of metaphors to paragraphs in each speech is about 30 per cent. The *First Olynthiac* has 6 metaphors in 28 paragraphs (i.e. 21 per cent.) and the speech *On the Peace* 5 in 25 (i.e. 20 per cent.). She then asks why should these two speeches have a smaller proportion of metaphors than the *Second* and *Third Olynthiac*. She has a different explanation in each case. The subject-matter of the speech *On the Peace* did not inspire Demosthenes with enthusiasm; in the *First Olynthiac*, on the other hand, he was deliberately restraining his enthusiasm so as to produce an impression of cold precision. Both statements may be true, but it is doubtful whether any inference could be drawn from the statistics themselves.

It would need an exceptionally industrious reviewer to attempt a systematic check of the accuracy of these statistics, but a casual glance at the text will disprove many statements. On p. 32 it is said that the *Second Philippic* has no example of the substantival masculine singular participle; there is, in fact, one in paragraph 13. On p. 34 it is said that the *Third Philippic* has only one substantival masculine participle in the perfect (in 68); there is also one in 24. The speech *On the Crown* is said to have no substantival masculine participles in the future; one notices examples in 239, 257, 285, and 287. On p. 49 it is said that separation of co-ordinate words by an intermediate phrase is totally absent in the *First Philippic*; there is a clear example of this device in 3 (ὅν ἔδρα, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ θεόσησθε). On p. 71 it is said that the *Third Olynthiac* does not use the device of repeating the meaning of a word by a synonym; there are examples in 32 (μικρὰ καὶ φαῦλα) and in 35 (ἀργεῖν καὶ σχολάζειν).

Attempts to relate the stylistic qualities of the speeches to Demosthenes' character and its development are sometimes unconvincing, particularly in the treatment of his use of 'figures of speech'. Rhetorical questions are found to be rare in the early speeches and much more frequent in the later speeches; from this is deduced the growth of his self-confidence and assurance. On the other

hand, 'dialogue' (supposed objections, invented answers, etc.) is found to be never frequent and to be rarer in the later speeches; it is explained that this is an artificial device alien to his natural sincerity. However, attempts to give a false impression of extempore speaking (correction of previous statements, etc.) are found to be equally common at all periods and in all contexts. This apparent inconsistency is explained as follows: 'Il en use seulement dans la mesure où elles sont vraiment naturelles, c'est-à-dire en accord avec les exigences de sa sensibilité.' It is difficult to avoid the impression that the qualities of Demosthenes' style are being made to fit in with a preconceived idea of his character. It is dangerous to put too much faith in the adage *οἶος ὁ τρόπος, τοιοῦτος καὶ ὁ λόγος*. This may be more applicable to Demosthenes than to many writers, but any work dealing with Greek oratory which is based on this assumption is inevitably involved in errors and inconsistencies.

If the inferences drawn from the statistics sometimes seem forced, the general picture of Demosthenes' style is convincing and instructive. It is shown by numerous examples that with Demosthenes style is not a superimposed adornment, as it is with Isocrates, but the natural means of expressing the subject-matter. The detailed analysis reveals many qualities which have escaped one's notice, and one's sensitivity is quickened in re-reading the speeches. Blass treats this subject more objectively in the third volume of *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, but Dr. Ronnet's account shows a more sympathetic understanding of her author and is infinitely more readable. It is a considerable achievement to have produced a work consisting largely of facts and figures which can be read with interest and enjoyment from beginning to end.

The book is well indexed and there is a useful bibliography, although Preuss's *Index* is a surprising omission from a bibliography in a work of this kind. Minor misprints in the Greek are numerous.

King's College, Newcastle upon Tyne

H. LL. HUDSON-WILLIAMS

PLOTINUS

VINCENZO CILENTO: Plotino, *Enneadi*. Prima versione integra e commentario critico. Vol. I (*Enn.* i, ii): pp. xv+461. Vol. II (*Enn.* iii, iv): pp. 588. Vol. III, Parte i (*Enn.* v, vi), pp. 439; Parte ii, pp. 662. Bari: Laterza, 1947-9. Paper, L. 1000, 1800, 5200.

THIS is an heroic work. Fr. Cilento has not merely produced the first Italian translation of the whole of Plotinus—itself a great enough feat—but has made a careful study of the text, embodied in a critical commentary in which he has set about a thorough revision of the existing editions and a systematic return to the manuscript tradition. At the end (vol. iii. 2) comes a huge bibliography of publications relating to Plotinus, compiled by B. Mariën. The result, which follows on an edition and translation of Porphyry's *Life* by Cilento and Pugliese (1946), is a contribution to Plotinian studies of great importance: 'Vagliami il lungo studio e 'l grande amore.'

The text of Plotinus has had a curious history. Ficino's Latin translation appeared in 1492, but not till 1580 did the Greek text see the light in the edition of Perna. Thereafter textual criticism languished till the appearance of Creuzer's text (1835), which rested on a fresh examination of the manuscripts,

but from this edition to Bréhier's (1924-38) the principal changes in the text lay in the insertion of an increasing number of conjectures by Kirchhoff, Müller, and Volkmann. But in recent years a return to the manuscripts has been demanded and in part effected by a group of scholars among whom are Harder, Henry, and Cilento; and soon after Cilento's translation there appeared vol. i of Henry and Schwyzer's important edition, comprising Porphyry's *Life* and *Enneads* i-iii (Paris and Brussels, 1951).

In the establishment of the text Cilento follows principally the work of Henry, who divides the manuscripts into four groups, *w*, *x*, *y*, and *z*, and holds that they all derive from an archetype of (probably) c. ix-xii. Both hold that this tradition is in general more reliable than the citations in other authors, and that the scope for emendation is slight (however true this may be, Henry's confidence in the fidelity of the archetype is perhaps excessive). Both hold also that the discordant passages in Eusebius derive from the pre-Porphyrian edition of Plotinus' remains by Eustochius. The resulting achievement is signaled by a more accurate examination of the manuscripts, a more thorough attempt at their classification, and the rejection of numerous conjectures, mainly of the nineteenth century.

The appearance of the Henry-Schwyzler edition does not remove the value of Cilento's work. The text he adopts is the product of his own judgement, and the translation is careful and clear; the notes discuss textual problems and difficulties of interpretation in detail, and at points include observations and references illustrative of Plotinus' philosophy. The preface examines the relations of Plotinus to his disciples and original editors (Cilento does not believe in the traditional chronological 'canon') and (among other things) his influence on Leopardi; while the other material provided includes translations of Ficino's preface and of the ancient *Testimonia*, and accounts of the principal manuscripts. Vol. iii. 2, pp. 251-315, gives translations of the principal passages in earlier philosophers to which Plotinus alludes, followed by full indexes to the entire work.

The critical notes do not discuss all the variants, but include some minor ones not mentioned in Henry-Schwyzler. At the present time, however, they are naturally most valuable for *Enn.* iv-vi, not yet published in Henry-Schwyzler (Cilento, incidentally, follows Henry in cutting out the old iv. 1). At i. 1. 2 he reads ἦδη, not εἶδη; at i. 2. 5 he hesitates, but is probably right in favouring προπετοῦς; at iii. 2. 3 he assigns to E the reading πρόσφορον, but H.-S. state that it has the correct reading προσφόροις; at iii. 7. 1 he rightly reads ἄλλος, not ἄλλως; at iii. 8. 1 he apparently reads ὁ μὲν παίζειν ὁ δὲ σπουδάζειν; at iv. 1 (2). 2 the note does not make clear which παθόντος he wishes changed: presumably the second (on some of these passages see H.-S., vol. i, p. xxxi). The list of noteworthy points could be continued almost indefinitely, but the following selection is confined to Porphyry's *Life*: in ch. 1 Cilento reads ἔπειτα γράφοντος; in ch. 2 he reads κωλικῇ (so H.-S.), and rejects Μητουρνῶν for the conjectural Μιντούρνων; in ch. 4 he is probably right to add εἰς with Dübner after ὑποθέσεις, though H.-S. reject it; in ch. 7 he is inclined to read ἀμερείας, which they now accept; in the same chapter he reads ἕτερον (so H.-S.; but cf. Mariën in vol. iii. 2, p. 443); in ch. 9 he rightly restores Ποτάμῳ and ἐγγηγορότως (so H.-S.); in ch. 10 it would probably have been better to read φῆσαι, not φῆσιν, and to retain καὶ (καὶ διὰ φόβον); in ch. 11 he rightly reads οἰκείῳ, not οἰκετῶν; in ch. 13 he conjectures ἀεὶ after ἐράσμιος μὲν; at

the beginning of ch. 18 he is probably right to accept *Νουμηνίου*; in ch. 20 he silently adopts *ἀποδειξάμενοι* ('rivelarono', p. 25, l. 16), where *ἀποδείξάμενοι* should be read (with all the manuscripts).

Dr. Mariën's bibliography, which includes not far from 1,500 items, must command the greatest admiration. It covers Plotinus himself, his background, and his influence through the centuries in both East and West, and includes comments on some of the works and also notes on various topics, such as Plotinus' relation to astrology (p. 542), Neoplatonism and religion (pp. 544 ff.), the controversy over the Neoplatonic influences on St. Augustine (p. 561), and the *Theologia Aristotelis* (pp. 604 ff.). The compiler hopes apparently to expand further the section on Plotinus' oriental influence.

In such a work there must inevitably be errors and omissions, apart from the rapidity with which it becomes out of date. E. F. Carritt's *Philosophies of Beauty* belongs rightly to the section for partial translations, not to the discussions of Plotinus' aesthetics; R. H. S. Crossman, *Plato To-day* (p. 591), is not relevant for Plotinus' influence; and Cudworth's *True Intellectual System of the Universe* was first published in London in 1678 (pp. 533, 592). Apart from works published since this bibliography, here are a few addenda of varying degrees of importance: for the historical background it seems a pity to have omitted M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1926), and O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt* (Stuttgart, 1921); for the intellectual background, add H. A. Wolfson, *Philo* (2 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1947), A. D. Nock, *Conversion* (Oxford, 1933), and C. N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* (Oxford, 1940); among books on Plotinus himself add P. J. Jensen, *Plotin* (Copenhagen, 1948). H. R. Schwyzer's article 'Plotinos' (referred to on p. 482) has now appeared in Pauly-Wissowa, vol. xxi. 1 (1951). For other studies of Plotinus see B. Russell, *History of Western Philosophy* (London, 1946), pp. 308-21; F. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*, vol. i (London, 1946), pp. 463-75; J. F. Callahan, *Four Views of Time in Ancient Philosophy* (Cambridge, Mass., 1948); E. F. Carritt, *The Theory of Beauty* (London, 1914). On Plotinus' influence the following is a short list of possible additions: A. E. Taylor, 'The Philosophy of Proclus' (*Proc. Arist. Soc.* xviii (1917-18), pp. 600-35, reprinted in *Philosophical Studies* (London, 1934), pp. 151-91); R. Walzer, 'Arabic Transmission of Greek Thought in Mediaeval Europe' (*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester*, xxix (1945-6), pp. 160-83); R. Klibansky, *The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition* (London, 1939); W. Jaeger, *Humanism and Theology* (Milwaukee, 1943); R. Cudworth, *A Treatise concerning Eternal and Immutable Morality* (London, 1731); A. O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), esp. pp. 61 ff.; A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros* (Eng. trans. from the Swedish, 3 vols., London, 1932-9). A serious gap in the section on Plotinus' influence is the absence of any mention of the strong Neoplatonic influence on Russian religious philosophy down to Berdyaev and Lossky: see, for example, N. O. Lossky and J. S. Marshall, *Value and Existence* (London, 1935) (cf. now N. O. Lossky, *A History of Russian Philosophy* (London, 1952)).

POSIDONIUS, SENECA, AND MARCUS AURELIUS

HANS RUDOLF NEUENSCHWANDER: *Mark Aurels Beziehungen zu Seneca und Poseidonios*. Pp. viii+142. Bern: Haupt, 1951. Paper, 11.40 Sw.fr.

DR. NEUENSCHWANDER's aim can be stated briefly. He has examined the text of Marcus Antoninus and of Seneca's letters and philosophical treatises for conceptions which, while common to both, are not to be derived from the early Stoa but which fit in with the picture of Posidonius which has, especially on the continent of Europe, been prevalent since Reinhardt's *Poseidonios* (1921) and *Kosmos und Sympathie* (1926). He collects many passages from his two authors of which this is true, and brings them under the following main headings: (1) the conception of the world as a perfect organism, united by the powers of 'sympathy' and of 'nature'; (2) the foundation of human conduct on the conception of man as a part (*μέρος*) or, better, an organic member (*μέλος*) of the universe; (3) the treatment of all destruction as change, and of all events as contributing to the preservation (*σωτηρία*) of the perfect whole: hence a 'theodicy' which is not anthropocentric but cosmocentric (p. 69). Finally, Neuenschwander examines that part of the *Somnium Scipionis* which Harder thinks to depend in part on Posidonius (§§ 16-25), and points to parallels in Seneca and Antoninus. But his initial theme, which runs throughout the book, is the elucidation of Antoninus and the attempt to find in him a more or less consistent world-view which expresses not a pessimistic philosophy but a pantheistic optimism, which, though he admits that there is no definite evidence that Antoninus read Posidonius, is ultimately to be traced back to him. Further, he sees in this tradition an important source of Neoplatonism (esp. pp. 28-33).

The difficulties inherent in these contentions, as Neuenschwander realizes, spring from the inadequacies in our knowledge of Posidonius and the controversial nature of Reinhardt's reconstruction. Edelstein's promised collection of the fragments is still awaited, and the only one in existence is Bake's (1810). Meanwhile, though Reinhardt's work has been, with modifications, accepted by Pohlenz (most recently in his two-volume *Die Stoa* (1948-9)), large parts of it were questioned by R. M. Jones (cf. *Cl. Phil.* xviii (1923), pp. 202-28; xxvii (1932), pp. 113-35), and Edelstein's reconstruction (*A.J.P.* lvii (1936), pp. 286-325), which relies only on definite fragments, is much less luxuriant, while Festugière's attitude (cf. especially *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, vol. ii (1949), p. 459) is distinctly cautious. In the face of this welter of controversy, the safest course is to suspend further judgement until fuller knowledge of the fragments is available, and meanwhile to attribute to Posidonius only what the most certain fragments will allow, following provisionally the puritanical Edelstein. He, however, thinks that Posidonius' influence has been greatly exaggerated; that, far from being a monist (*Kosmos und Sympathie*, pp. 298-307), he believed in two distinct principles, God and matter (cf. *D.L.* vii. 134); that he confined 'sympathy' to organic nature; that he was not strictly a vitalist (despite Reinhardt, *Poseidonios*, p. 11) but made soul coextensive with organic nature; and that his philosophy and Neoplatonism are poles apart.

But even if much or all of this is true (and perhaps it is not), the value of Neuenschwander's work is not greatly diminished. His observations remain, and we shall merely have, for the present, to assign the joint influence on Seneca and Antoninus anonymously to the movement of cosmic religion which permeates much of Cicero's philosophical output and was vastly influential in the following centuries, leaving open the question how much is due to Posidonius. This is the procedure recommended by Festugière (*loc. cit.*) in his masterly work on Hellenistic philosophy and religion, which was not available to Neuenschwander and which serves in other ways, too, to supplement what he says. For Neuenschwander begins by contrasting pessimistic interpretations of Antoninus with optimistic, and rejecting the former; on the whole he seems right, and yet he is perhaps over-anxious to systematize, and slurs over the pessimistic strains. But let us try to see the matter in its full historical setting. Festugière sets out, in his as yet incomplete work, to show how ancient thought from Plato onwards displays two contrary trends, an optimistic pantheism leading to cosmic religion, and a pessimistic emphasis on transcendence which encourages a flight to the beyond. Looking at Antoninus in this way we can discern these two strains, while seeing that behind the tendency to optimism, whatever its immediate sources for him and for Seneca, there stand the *Timaeus*, *Laws*, and *De Philosophia*.

It is to Neuenschwander's great credit that, when these question-marks and footnotes have been added, his book remains a valuable contribution to the interpretation of Seneca and Antoninus. It is carefully written, and displays thorough knowledge of the literature available.

University College, Bangor

D. A. REES

THE LATIN HEXAMETER

CHARLES GORDON COOPER: *An Introduction to the Latin Hexameter*. Pp. ix+70. Melbourne and London: Macmillan, 1952. Limp cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR COOPER's brightly written little book will supply Australian and, maybe, other schoolboys with an excellent introduction to the study of the Latin, or at least the Virgilian hexameter. Over 90 per cent. of the instances (all usefully translated) are drawn from Virgil, and it might perhaps have been better if the author had confined himself to that poet, since the metrical usages of Ennius, Lucretius, and Horace—all occasionally cited—are so different.

The book is divided into four parts: the first deals with such matters as vowel quantity, word stress, and syllabification; the second with the hexameter itself, its caesuras, diaereses, elisions, pauses, and the conflict or coincidence of ictus and accent; the third with abnormalities such as hiatus, hypermetron, and vocalic contraction and consonantization; and in a short last chapter practical advice is given on methods of scansion and reading, ending with Quintilian's excellent precept *ediscere . . . erit optimum*. There is also an index of lines to which reference is made.

The information given is clear and accurate, though it is scarcely correct to write *tout court* 'the contracted genitive singular in *ī* is the established form in classical Latin for *all* [italics mine] second declension nouns in *-ius* and *-ium*',

(p. 3, note), and to regard the Saturnian as *indubitably* a stress metre (p. 5) is rash. The statement on p. 14 to the effect that 'in both *infelix* and *indoctus* the syllable *in-*, being closed, is long; though the *i* of the prefix (it is the same prefix in both words) is long in *infelix*, but short in *indoctus*' will be completely baffling to any reader not acquainted with the curious passage in Cicero's *Orator* (§ 159) or with such elucidatory comments on it as are contained in Lindsay's *Latin Language* or Sommer's *Handbuch*. The sentence should have been either explained or omitted. And surely it is incorrect to say (p. 26) that 'if the final foot <of the hexameter> is a trochee, there *must*¹ be a <sense> pause'. But the one really distressing feature of the book is its determination to find an onomatopoeic *purpose* in everything. When Professor Cooper tells us that Horace's *labitur et labetur in omne volubilis ævum* 'is as smooth flowing as the stream of which it speaks' (he might rather have cited Virgil's *fluminaque antiquos subterlabentia muros*) we can agree with him; and when he writes of the onomatopoeic use of hissing *s*'s and snarling *r*'s we may accord a measure of credence—though not perhaps to the statement that 'in *ex illo fluere ac retro sublapsa referre* | *spes Danaum; fractae vires, aversa deae mens* the large number of sibilants and liquids contributes greatly to the sound-picture of an ebbing tide'; but we feel that the Australian schoolboy and most other people will be justly sceptical when they are asked to believe that Horace used 'the rude bisection of the line *hac rabiosa fugit canis; hac lutulenta ruit sus*' to suggest the way 'in which a city crowd parts smartly to make way for a mad dog or a muddy sow'; that the weak caesura in *inde alius conatur: adempto surgere crure* (Lucr. iii. 652) suggests 'the grotesque attempt of a soldier to rise after one of his legs has been lopped off in battle', or that that in Ennius' *labitur uncta carina: per æquora cana celocis* 'mimics the dipping of a yacht in a choppy sea', or that in *conticuere; super fessos complectitur artus* (V. *Aen.* ii. 253) 'the dying down of talk before the onset of sleep'. And can we really believe such statements as that in *Cecropiumque thymum et grave olentia centaurea* Virgil uses a spondaic hexameter 'to recall the heavy, clinging scent of centaur'; or that in *nec rapit immensos orbes per humum* (V. *Georg.* ii. 153) 'the bulk of the words mimics the snake's gigantic size'; or that 'in *constitit, atque oculis Phrygia agmina circumspexit* the double elision'—why not, too, the spondaic fifth foot?—'suggests the way in which Sinon's eyes slid from face to face of those surrounding him'; or that in the conflicts of accent and ictus in Ennius' *Hispane, non Romane memoretis* 'loqui me' 'the outlandish sound is probably meant to suggest the outlandish accent of the Spaniard who uttered it', whereas the coincidence of accent and ictus in Horace's *dignum mente domoque legentis honesta Neronis* 'points a compliment to the young prince Tiberius'; or that in the same poet's *solve senescentem mature sanus equum, ne peccet ad extremum ridendus et ilia ducat* 'the trite monosyllable *ne* causes the first line to behave exactly like the aging horse of which it speaks. The line itself falters laughably towards the end and strains its flanks.' What hypermetron can do in this way will perhaps surprise the reader of pp. 47–48, where among many other instances Professor Cooper cites *lacertos(que)* (*Aen.* v. 422) as suggesting 'the surprising revelation of size when a heavyweight boxer strips for the ring'. In short, so long as the professor stays in the realm of fact he is admirable: *haud item* when he strays into that of theory.

Brasenose College, Oxford

MAURICE PLATNAUER

¹ See Winbolt's *Lat. Hex. Verse* (p. 154), a footnote where (p. 29) the reference is book cited only once by C., and then in a wrong. It should be 'p. 121', not 'p. 20'.

AUGUSTUS AND POST-AUGUSTAN POETRY

FRANZ DORNSEIFF: *Verschmähtes zu Vergil, Horaz und Properz*. (Ber. der Sächs. Akad. der Wiss. zu Leipzig, Phil.-Hist. Kl., Bd. 97, Heft 6.) Pp. 108. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1951. Paper, DM. 11.50.

LÉON HERRMANN: *L'Âge d'Argent doré* (Travaux de la Fac. de Phil. et Lettres de l'Univ. de Bruxelles). Pp. viii+174. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1951. Paper, 700 fr.

PROFESSORS Dornseiff and Herrmann discuss *inter alia* poems at one time or another attributed to Virgil and, not surprisingly, reach conflicting conclusions. The former begins by examining the content and literary character of each poem in the *Catalepton* and shows that they are written in the manner of Catullus. All, he believes, are the work of Virgil. His interpretation is enlivened but not always strengthened by arguments from analogy (we are reminded on p. 25 of the contrast between the earlier and later work of Goethe) and by such original metaphors as the following: 'Wer von Homer commend in der Aeneis liest, hat das Gefühl, zwischen Weihrauch und Marzipan zu geraten, es ist fast physisch unmöglich.' *Aetna* is next considered. Dornseiff rejects the attribution to Lucilius Iunior and plumps for an earlier date. The author, it is argued, is either Virgil himself (closely imitating Lucretius) or someone very near to Virgil. The pith of the argument here is that many of the elements of the poem commonly defined as post-Augustan could equally well be pre-Augustan. There follows a novel interpretation of the *Culex* based on a communication submitted to the author by Dr. Paul Thielscher of Berlin, in which are stressed the similarities between the memorial which the grateful shepherd builds for the gnat and the Mausoleum of Augustus, the prototype of the Mausoleum of Hadrian. If Virgil is the author of our *Culex* he (as a bucolic poet) is the shepherd, Augustus, who had some years before come to the poet's aid, is the gnat and the projected epic is the elaborate tomb of the gnat. Dornseiff would date the poem 27 B.C., that is to say in the year in which Octavian assumed the cognomen 'Augustus'. It is further suggested that the passage beginning *o bona pastoris* (ll. 58-97) refers to Horace's criticism of Virgil (in *Epode* ii) 'als bukolisch-agrarischen Schwärmer'. The present writer is not qualified to judge the archaeological evidence put forward. But there is little in the *Culex* worthy of Virgil, particularly of the poet of the *Georgics*; nor does it help to ascribe it to one of Virgil's circle. Dornseiff's discussion of parallel passages does not remove the strong reasons for regarding the work as a not very skilful forgery. Next is considered the dating of *Epode* xvi, which is held to be later than *Eclogue* iv and to represent a highly sceptical reaction to it.

The author goes on to trace parallels between the *Odes* and *Satires* of Horace and the Septuagint. The poet's father, he conjectures on somewhat slender evidence, was at least a proselyte. The son was fond of adapting themes from the LXX (especially from Psalms, Proverbs, Jeremiah, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus), though his interest in Judaism stopped far short of *Gottesangst* and belief in miracles.

The rest of the book offers further parallels between Virgil, Horace, and

Propertius, together with additional quotations from the Psalms where their subject-matter and its disposition resemble certain Odes. Here the case is marred by overstatement. For Propertius the following dates (by no means universally acceptable) are suggested; 28 B.C., (or 32) Book i; 26, Book ii; circa 22, Book(s) (i-) iii; 16/15, Book iv (published in his lifetime). On p. 94 Prop. ii. 13. 25-26 is quoted (*magna* being read in 25). The metrical abnormality is regarded as 'lautexpressive dichterische Freiheit' and rendered thus: 'meine drei Bücher, die soo grooss sind'! This volume contained numerous pencilled corrections when it reached the reviewer's hands; but the unobserved defects (omission of Latin, Greek, or German words, wrong or missing references, poor spacing and slipshod typesetting) are no less numerous. The layout has for the most part a cramped look, though extensive Biblical quotations are spread out with a fine disregard for economy. And yet Dornseiff sees fit to crack a little joke on p. 52 about 'die Papierknappheit'.

M. Herrmann's book is in every way a worthy successor to his unique *Phédre et ses Fables* (see C.R. lxx. 182). Believing that in the second half of the first century A.D. there flourished an abundant literature of imitation and pastiche, he assigns to this category a miscellaneous collection of poems and sets out to discover, as far as possible, not only their true authors but also the dates of composition. Herrmann is an intrepid and undaunted explorer, who would not be at a loss if his chart of the ocean were, like that so acceptable to the Bellman and his crew, 'a perfect and absolute blank'. Here are a few of his findings. Propertius iv (composed between A.D. 62 and 79) was written by C. Passennus Paulus Propertius; C. Caesius Bassus is the author of *Nux* (A.D. 56 or 57) and *Lygdamus* (A.D. 89 or 90); Petronius is presented with *Copa*, *Moretum*, *Elegiae in Maecenatem*, and *Consolatio ad Liuiam*; Lucilius Iunior receives not only *Aetna* but *Ciris* too; *Catalepton* 2 (*Corinthiorum amator iste uerborum*) is obviously the work of the Emperor Titus (who with eyes to see could miss the acrostic *TITI*, formed so easily by the transposition of lines 2 and 3?) But there are so many other treats in store for the reader of this book that the reviewer must resist the temptation to reveal all. His inimitable textual surgery is a perpetual source of wonder. *Humano capiti ceruicem pictor equinam | iungere si uelit . . .* These delicate operations are accompanied by a triumphant 'on lira donc', 'ce qui justifie pleinement notre conjecture', or 'nous incite à lire'. Let us in conclusion (turning a blind eye to the misprints which strew the page) look at one or two patients after treatment. The first merely wandered into the wrong ward; he is Persius v. 41-42 and wears a label 'elegiac couplet'. The second, a pentameter (*Corpus Tibull.* iii. 5. 10), appears as *dextera nec umquam trita uenena dedit (cuiquam)*. The third, a senarius, has suffered a sea-change into *iocosa Venus molle ruperit latus (Venus iocosa)*. A fourth (*Catalepton* 8. 5, a hexameter) is in some distress—*commendo, in primisque matrem. tu nunc eris illi (patrem)*. Next (*ibid.* 13 a 1) another hexameter—*Callimachi sub hoc caelo est, iniuria saecli* (a notorious crux). *Cetera quid referam?* Did they not cry out *non habui febrem, Symmache; nunc habeo?*

MARTIAL

M. Valeri Martialis [*Liber de Spectaculis*], *Epigrammaton Libri XIV*. Iterum recensuit CAESAR GIARRATANO. (Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum.) Pp. xxxvi+565. Turin: Paravia, 1951. Paper. L.2380.

GIARRATANO's revised edition is a big advance on the first (1920-2), and good use has been made of work done on Martial since its appearance. The edition is, however, undistinguished and offers little that is new or original.

The *praefatio*, which has been considerably enlarged, contains a full account of the manuscript tradition followed by an assessment of the relative merits of the three families based on the number of interpolations in each. Giarratano criticizes Keil for his disparagement (expressed 'nuper', i.e. 1909) of the α -family, and from comparative lists of interpolations (some dubious) concludes, like Heraeus, that the order of respectability is i. α , ii. β , iii. γ . The lists have been carelessly compiled and there are errors and discrepancies of all kinds: e.g. p. xv *deprensa* (vi. 64. 3) is noted as an interpolation in α , p. xvi as an interpolation in $\beta\gamma$; it is almost certainly the true reading; I note, amongst others, seven errors or discrepancies on p. xxi and six on p. xxv. There follow a list of *testimonia* and another of editions and principal contributions; striking omissions in the latter are Heraeus's masterly survey of the manuscript tradition in *Rhein. Mus.*, N.F. lxxiv and Housman's articles in *J. Phil.* xxx and *Class. Quart.* xiii; no mention is made of Izaac's useful edition and translation in the Budé series.

In his text, which has been completely revised, Giarratano does not resort to any novelties of reading or punctuation. It may be conveniently measured by what we must regard as the standard text of Martial, viz. that of Heraeus. Giarratano's text differs seven or eight times in the case of both proper names (e.g. *Attale* ii. 7) and of word-order (i. 13. 4 *quod tu* seems retrograde) and in some fifty or so other readings. He does not adopt or propose any original conjecture of his own. In the choice of variants the following divergencies from Heraeus's text have much to commend them: i. 41. 2 *uerna es* and v. 44. 1 *factum est*, i. 88. 9 *perneuerit*, iii. 42. 4 *maius*, iv. 67. 8 *uis*, ix. 22. 2 *populus*, 27. 7 and xiv. 130. 2: (*n*)*usquam*; less acceptable are iii. 80. 1 *quereris*, ix. 101. 4 *raraque*, xii. 43. 3 *Didymae*, xiv. 186. 2 *ipsius et*; others are i. 105. 1 *agris*, ii. 11. 10 *quae est*, vii. 17. 9 *delicata*, 35. 4 *nulla*, x. 12. 9 *adgnosendus*, 37. 6 *acos*, 77. 3 *fuisse*, xiii. 69. 2 *domino*. In a very few cases he follows the manuscripts where Heraeus resorts to conjecture: we are glad to see Heinsius's amateurish *Caesar*, *io* disappear in *Spect.* 30. 10, uncertain as we may feel about a return to *Caesarea*; v. 20. 11 *neuter* is defensible, as is certainly ix. 54. 10 *miluus ad astra*; x. 48. 20 Heinsius's *trima*, however, seems essential; xiv. 158. 1 *apta* ($\beta\gamma$) leaves *neca* (T) unexplained and *nata* (Scriverius) is preferable. In rather more cases he admits a conjecture where Heraeus adheres to the manuscripts; the following small alterations all seem desirable: iv. 58. 2 *nam*, v. 38. 3 *seca*, vii. 14. 9 *senos*, 96. 4 *male*, ix. 48. 8 *pallida* (beyond all doubt), 59. 19 *ueros*; bad conjectures adopted are ii. 14. 13 *iterum ternis*, iii. 13. 2 *putri* (thoroughly shallow; *patri* may be proverbial¹), 32. 1 *an possim—quaeris*; doubtful is vii. 47. 6 *tristities* (abandoned by its author,

¹ Helm, *Phil. Woch.* xlvi. 88, compares Luc *Gall.* 4.

Housman), and for a new conjecture i. 70. 15 *ament* (Castiglione), where $\alpha\beta\gamma$ concur, no excuse is offered and none is evident; iii. 20. 12 *Europes* (not reported as a conjecture) and 93. 18 *nupturire* may or may not be right. In the following cases, where Heraeus has unconvincing remedies of his own, Giarratano returns to more venerable proposals, none of which satisfies: *Spect.* 19. 3 *cornuto ardore*, 28. 2 *Parthaoniam*, vi. 21. 10 *parce tuo*. *Spect.* 21 b remains dubious whether *mersa* (G.) or *uersa* (H.) is read. In xii *praef.* (fin.) the incomprehensible *nitore* should have been obelized by both editors. In punctuation Giarratano offers nothing new: in vii. 36. 6 he rightly adopts Izaak's question-mark, and in viii. 25. 2 Gilbert's (not, as stated, Buecheler's) method; in vii. 26. 4 he regrettably returns to Lindsay and neglects Heraeus's essential correction in vii. 38. 1. Misprints, some very ugly, occur in *Spect.* 2. 7, ii *praef.* 5, 30. 5, 40. 4-5, iii. 63. 8, v. 18. 7, 23. 3, 80. 7, vi. 29. 7, viii. 8. 10, vii. 59. 5, ix. 4. 3, 20. 8, 61. 18, 97. 5-6, x. 12. 8, 85. 4, xi. 41. 8, 71. 5, 76. 4, 84. 11, 94. 2, xii. 33. 1, xiii. 100. 1, xiv. 24. 1, 122. 2, 124. 1, 133. 1, 148. 2.

The apparatus criticus, now in its proper position, i.e. beneath the text, is clear and concise, but apart from the occasional citation of references offers little elucidatory guidance. There are a number of inaccuracies: I note wrong or inadequate information, partly due to negligent proof-reading, at i. 8. 2, 45. 2, 58. 3, ii. 7. 1, 30. 3, iii. 20. 12, v. 19. 13, vi. 12. 2, 60. 2, 69. 2, vii. 47. 6, viii. 25. 2, ix. 28. 8, 31. 1, 94. 4 (two errors), 101. 22, xiii. 41, xiv. 200 (four errors). There are various misprints, and strange things have happened at iii. 8. 2, 58. 39 and 44, xii. 3. 6, xiii. 76. 2 (cf. 81. 2). Giarratano claims to have gathered together all conjectures made since the *editio princeps* and reports a select number, rather too many at times, e.g. the futilities recorded at xii. 59. 9, where a reference to Housman, *C.R.* xl. 19, would have been helpful.

The text is followed by an index of initial lines and an *index nominum*; in the latter *Mandatus* (xiv. 29. 2) should have been included and *Parthaonia fera*, an unhappy guess of Buecheler in *Spect.* 28. 2, suppressed; *cerdo*, not *Cerdo*, is read in iii. 59. 1 and 99. 1 (but *Cerdo* iii. 16), and *Attale*, not *Attice*, in ii. 7; and no such place as *Summenium* (or anything like it) is referred to in i. 34. 6.

University College of Wales, Aberystwyth

A. HUDSON-WILLIAMS

CICERO, *DE LEGIBUS*

KONRAT ZIEGLER: M. Tullius Cicero, *De Legibus*. (Heidelberger Texte, Lat. Reihe, 20.) Pp. 148. Heidelberg: Kerle, 1950. Paper, DM. 2.90.

THERE has been so little work on the text of the *De Legibus* published in the last forty years that the appearance of a new critical edition is an event of considerable interest. Ziegler has nothing new to say about the composition of the treatise, or about the readings of the manuscripts and the relations between them. But he is prodigal of suggestions for improving the text. (Some seventy of his own conjectures appear, fifty-five of them adopted in his text.) Many of the changes involve the insertion of groups of letters omitted *librariorum incuria*. The principle is sound enough, but there is little justification for such corrections as *in opinione* <po>*sita* i. 45, and <di>*vitiis vel subsidiis temporum* <con>*victus* ii. 45. Other conjectures are more arbitrary: *beatiore*s for *melio*res i. 32, *non eum ipsi quaerunt grati quoi referant gratiam* i. 49. (In both cases conjectures by

Philippson deserved to be mentioned: *similiores*—an almost certain correction—and *eum ipsi spernunt grati quoi referunt gratiam*.) There is no good reason for altering *spero* to *sereno* ii. 69, or for abandoning the proverbial *fluctus in simpulo* for *flatus* (MSS. *fletus*) in *simpulo* iii. 36. Against these ill-judged conjectures may be set some improvements in the text: *argute* i. 27, *ita communis intellegentias nobis natura effecit* (based on a suggestion of Bake) i. 44, *apta virtuti* i. 56, *libidines inmittendi* ii. 37.

Ziegler's apparatus criticus, though strictly limited, gives a fair indication of manuscript readings (his conjecture *varietas* i. 29 is a well-known reading of some of the *deteriores*) and a selection of older emendations in a small compass—a far cry from the wordy polemics of Vahlen's second edition! Occasionally more details of readings are called for (e.g. on *nihil minus civile* eqs. iii. 42), and notes on the lacunae at i. 39, i. 57, ii. 5, ii. 28, and ii. 39 (this last gap posited by Ziegler himself) should have been given. If these omissions are due to lack of space, additional abbreviations of names might have been used and some of the notes in the Index of Proper Names omitted.

Ziegler also gives useful introductory notes on the composition of the *De Legibus*, Cicero's sources, and the manuscripts, a few explanatory notes, and a short Bibliography, to which should be added: C. W. Keyes, *A.J.P.* xiii (1921), 309–23, E. A. Robinson, *T.A.P.A.* lxxi (1940), 524–31 and *T.A.P.A.* lxxiv (1943), 109–12. (The latter should perhaps have been mentioned in note 3, page 11.)

The text and apparatus are admirably printed, and misprints are few. Minerva makes an unexpected appearance *inter suos* in the apparatus on page 72.

University of St. Andrews

J. H. SIMON

THE BUDÉ CICERO

CICÉRON: *Discours*. Tome XVIII: *Pour Marcellus, pour Ligarius, pour le roi Déjotarus*. Texte établi et traduit par MARCEL LOB. (Collection Budé.) Pp. 122 (partly double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1952. Paper.

IN establishing the text of the *Caesarianae* Lob follows closely the path marked out by Reeder, whose dissertation on the manuscripts (Jena, 1906) consolidated and continued the work of Clark and Peterson. Lob's text therefore shows little advance on those of A. Klotz (Leipzig, 1918) and Clark (Oxford, 1918). (The latter is not mentioned by Lob, though it completely superseded the earlier edition, cited on page 19.) His only innovation is the transposition (*Lig.* 11) of *qui usque ad sanguinem incitari solent odio* to follow *barbarorum* instead of *mores*. This certainly makes for an easy reading of the passage, but it is hard to see how the clause came to be misplaced. The omission of *qui* in the β manuscripts makes it seem more likely that the clause is an early gloss.

When he has to decide between variants, Lob generally chooses wisely, as in *Lig.* 21 *verborum*, *Lig.* 30 *erravi, temere feci*, and *Deiot.* 34 in *victoria vidimus*. Among the emendations which he adopts, Faernus's *sensusque eos* (*Marc.* 10), Wagner's *Peium* and *Blucium* (*Deiot.* 17, 21), and Reeder's *exacta iam aetate* (*Deiot.* 28) are improvements on Clark's text. But in *Marc.* 12 *condicione omnes iure* Clark was probably right in regarding *condicione* as an intrusive variant which has in the β manuscripts ousted the correct *iure*. Lob may be right in retaining (*Lig.* 14) *a te . . . oppugnari et . . . tollere*, but it would be better to read

in tali <te> miseria tollere with Schoell. The β reading *amicitiae culpam* (*Deiot.* 10) is alleged to mean 'une faute sur le plan de l'amitié'—a strange use of *culpa* with the genitive to which the expression *crimen maiestatis*, quoted by Klotz, lends inadequate support.

The apparatus criticus is easy to handle (though lack of a system of line-numbering in Budé prose texts is a handicap) and generally reliable. The excision of *falso* (*Marc.* 30) is attributed to Richter-Eberhard instead of Weiske; in *Deiot.* 11 the β reading appears to be *enuntiabatur*; and *ille quidem* (*Deiot.* 18) requires a note. L should be deleted in the apparatus to *Lig.* 7.

Lob is lavish with introductory matter, analyses, comment (commendably candid) on Cicero's arguments, and notes on historical details. The last clearly cannot delve too deeply in controversial issues, but an indication might perhaps be given where such controversy exists. Lob boldly asserts that Caesar's powers were due to expire in February 49 (pp. 5 and 24), and he grossly misleads when he says (p. 36) that in 46 Caesar held tribunician power for life and a three-year censorship. The reference he quotes in support of the latter claim (*ad Fam.* ix. 15. 5) certainly does not warrant such a supposition, and Lob does not refer to the passages in Dio which have led some scholars to believe in the grant in 48 of tribunician power for life and in 46 of a *praefectura morum* for three years.

Lob's translation is neat and pleasant to read, but tends to do less than justice to Cicero's *oratio uberior*, particularly in the *pro Marcello*. A few mis-translations occur. 'Dans leur destin' can hardly be what Cicero meant by *naturam et condicionem* (*Marc.* 8). It makes nonsense to translate *neque enim ego illa nec ulla umquam secutus sum arma civilia* (*Marc.* 14) 'je n'ai pris part ni alors, ni jamais à aucune guerre civile', and the point of *Marc.* 20 is lost if we translate 'c'est ton plus beau titre de gloire que d'autres aient pensé ne rien avoir à redouter de toi'. *Liceat esse miseros* (*Lig.* 18) does not in that context mean 'qu'on nous laisse à notre malheur'. The phrase *aetas iniens* is curiously mis-translated in *Deiot.* 2 and 26, and there are two obvious errors in *Deiot.* 15 (*in eo tyrannum inveniri et cum regno . . . distractus esset*).

The number of misprints is not large, but insufficient care has been taken with references. In the text add *munera* after *monumenta* in *Marc.* 28, and *vide* after *reformidem* in *Lig.* 6, and read *ad meum aliquem fructum* in *Lig.* 8. In the apparatus there is a confused note on *Marc.* 2 (read *qui Eγ cum BDL qui cum α*). The following corrections to references may be mentioned: p. 27, n. 1, *ad Fam.* iv. 8; p. 38, n. 1, *ad Att.* viii. 9. 4; p. 43, n. 2 *B.C.* iii. 82. 3; p. 60, n. 2, *Plut. Cic.* xxxix. 6; p. 88, n. 1, *Strabo* xii. 5. 2; and p. 96, n. 2, *Phil.* ii. 93.

University of St. Andrews

J. H. SIMON

THE INSTITUTIONES OF CASSIODORUS

An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings. Translated with an introduction and notes by LESLIE WEBBER JONES. Pp. xviii+233. New York, Columbia University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1946. Cloth, \$3.

PROFESSOR JONES deserves warm thanks for this first English translation of the *Institutiones*, and an introduction concerned particularly with the problems of

Cassiodorus' later life and influence. In spite of the occasional obscurity of Cassiodorus' language, the translation is largely successful, though the propriety of retaining features of the style of the original is questionable. If Jones is sometimes too literal, it is because he avoids the tendency to paraphrase which characterizes Hodgkin's version of the *Variae*.

There is some unevenness in the Introduction: section i deals with the ancestry, birthplace, and education of Cassiodorus. Scyllacium receives two and a half pages, the author's education only six lines: the description of Scyllacium is more relevant to the account of the monastic foundation there (p. 22).

Section ii traces the public life of Cassiodorus, section iii his career after his retirement and subsequent *conversio*, the various interpretations of which are discussed. The two parts of his life are kept distinct, in spite of his activities in Constantinople in approximately 550: F. Giunta, moreover (in *Jordanes e la cultura dell' alto medio evo*, Palermo, 1952), suggests that Cassiodorus' support of Theodoric's policy was based as much on cultural as on political grounds: of this unifying link more might perhaps be made.

Section iii also contains some observations on Cassiodorus' style (pp. 37 ff.); here Jones unaccountably represents as specifically Cassiodoran such common features of late Latin as the extensive use of superlatives, often without superlative force; the misuse of *nimis*; the employment of two (often synonymous) adjectives in combination: and in two at least of his examples of 'complicated and unnecessary periphrases', *probor esse compulsus* and *reliquisse cognoscor* (pp. 37-38), he does not recognize the late Latin practice of employing certain verbs as little more than auxiliaries. Both these examples, moreover, furnish a *cursus planus*; and this may well have influenced Cassiodorus' choice of expression. A variation of 'parenthetical expressions' is strangely taken as an indication of 'a genuine feeling for style'.

The vocabulary receives brief comment: the difficulty of determining between classical and late Latin senses of words and syntactical usages in Cassiodorus is indicated. But it is nowhere suggested that some progress towards establishing an author's practice in regard to a word or construction can be made by comparison of all the instances of it in his work. Such evidence, while not conclusive, has at least equal value with that provided by any other method.

The essentially moderate claim of M. J. Suelzer, in *The Clausulae in Cassiodorus* (1944), that the evidence afforded by *clausulae* aids the determination of the 'authenticity of one of several textual variants', is too hastily rejected by Jones (p. 39): he appears to have been led to this view by Suelzer's application of her thesis. In this part of her work, as well as in an ill-advised footnote, she falls into error in assuming that a general preference for a type of *clausula* argues its use on each occasion where doubt about the correct reading arises. But her application does not invalidate the claim, recently propounded with more caution by Å. J. Fridh in his *Études critiques et syntaxiques sur les Variae de Cassiodore* (1950). Jones, furthermore, reviewing Suelzer's book in *C.P.* xli, 1946, admitted (pp. 120, 121) in respect of two of her examples that 'it is likely that the type of *clausula* is a valid criterion for determining the true reading'.

Section iv deals with the fate of Vivarium and its books, and has already been shown by earlier reviewers to be largely superseded. Section v, on Cassiodorus' influence on medieval culture, embodies material contained in Jones's

article in *Speculum*, xx, 1945 (pp. 433-42): some omissions are remedied in his 'Further Notes concerning Cassiodorus' Influence on Mediaeval Culture' (*Speculum*, xxii, 1947, pp. 254-6). It is unfortunate that these corrections and additions were not incorporated in the Introduction; as it is, no attempt has been made to relate them to it, and the references in the 'Further Notes' are to the earlier article only.

The account of the manuscripts in section vi is mainly derived from Mynors. The interrelation of, at any rate, the most important manuscripts could have been made more clear by including *stemmata*: the only indication of their established kinship is confined to a brief note (p. 58, n. 1), which also contains the sole explanation of the *sigla* used for the archetypes of various groups of manuscripts.

A brief note on printed editions concludes the Introduction.

Mention must be made of the faults of the Index, 'prepared by a professional indexer', and the presence of a number of errata. The annotations are frequently elementary, the result, it may be, of the translator's consideration for the possible requirements of a wider circle of readers; it is less easy, however, to find an excuse for the omission of necessary comment.

University of Manchester

D. R. BRADLEY

NOTE

In order to remedy the defect mentioned in paragraph 7, I add the following list of parallel references; the figures given first refer to the article in *Speculum*, xx, those which follow to the passage in the Introduction at which the additional note is relevant. p. 434, n. 7; p. 26, n. 39. p. 435, n. 1; p. 48, n. 2. p. 435, n. 3; p. 48, n. 4. p. 436, vv. 3-4; p. 49, vv. 21-23 (this under a sub-heading 'mention of Cassiodorus, but of no particular work!'). p. 436, n. 3a; p. 49, n. 10. p. 436, n. 6; p. 50, n. 13. p. 437, v. 1; p. 51, v. 5. p. 437, v. 2; p. 51, v. 7. p. 437, n. 9; p. 51, n. 31 (for the reference to n. 13 of the article in *Speculum*, substitute reference to the Introduction, p. 52, n. 35). p. 438, v. 11; p. 52, v. 23. p. 438, v. 29; p. 53, v. 20. p. 438, v. 32; p. 53, v. 24 (i.e. 'the addition to Introd., p. 51, v. 7'). p. 438, n. 1; p. 52, n. 38. p. 438, n. 6; p. 53, n. 43 (i.e. 'the addition to Introd., p. 48, n. 4'). p. 438, n. 11; p. 53, n. 48. p. 439, v. 22; p. 54, v. 25 (i.e. 'the addition to Introd., p. 52, n. 38'). p. 439, v. 28; p. 54, v. 32. p. 439, v. 35; p. 55, v. 7. p. 439, v. 38; p. 55, v. 13 (i.e. 'the addition to Introd., p. 54, v. 32'). p. 439, n. 2; p. 54, n. 52. p. 439, n. 20; p. 55, n. 70. p. 440, v. 2; p. 55, v. 18. p. 441, v. 9; p. 57, v. 10 (the change made in the Introduction, but not the addition; 'the addition to p. 54, v. 25'). p. 441, n. 14; p. 57, n. 106. p. 442, vv. 4-5; p. 48, vv. 24-26 (for 'fifth' read 'third').

PAPYRI

C. H. ROBERTS and E. G. TURNER: *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library Manchester*. Vol. IV. Pp. xvii+211; 6 plates. Manchester: University Press, 1952. Cloth, £5 5s. net.

THE editing of the last volume in so illustrious a series, in itself no light task, has not been made easier by palaeographical difficulties which must have severely taxed the patience and ingenuity of the editors. But their labours have been rewarded by a rich harvest of documentary papyri. Of literary texts there are only two fragments, one of Greek hexameters, the other of Latin prose, neither certainly identifiable. Of the Ptolemaic documents from the

Zenon Archive, reproduced exactly as published by Edgar, 562, which helped to determine the chronology of the Penteteris Festival, and 564, whose metrological data enabled Segré to infer the quantity of the Ptolemaic *chous*, have already been of great value. ἀπ[αρνο]ν is suggested for π[υθο]ν (555, 8), κ[ατ] ἀρχήν in 569, 7, but the translation of παρών (562, 11) and κατασκευάσων (568, 19) could have been improved upon. Of the remaining Ptolemaic documents, 572 throws light on the native policy of the Ptolemies; 578 gives a new sense of ἐκλογή (= 'special tax'), not far removed from that borne in some of Preisigke's examples under 'Rechnungsausgleich'; 583, already published, is interesting for the study of Ptolemaic viticulture and Polybian chronology, but τὸ καθ' αὐτόν in Thuc. ii. 11. 3 (5 n.) is not easily rendered 'the section under him'; 588 finally establishes Πέρσαι τῆς ἐπιγονῆς as a legal fiction. Some *addenda lexicis* are worth noting, e.g. συννεκροτάφος (= 'fellow-member of burial-guild'), φασήλιον (= 'barge'), and χρηματοφύλαξ (= 'treasurer'), while in 582 Καῖσαρ is indeclinable.

Parts IV (Greek) and V (Latin) comprise Roman documents. 594 enables the taxable population of Karanis to be estimated at over 1,000 males. 595 points to serious evils in Egypt in the *quinquennium Neronis*. 599, already published, supplies, with *P.S.I.* xii. 1240, our only data for a *gerousia* in Egypt elsewhere than in Alexandria. Neither of the two possible objections raised to regarding 604 as a Christian letter convince: the reference to the Evil Eye only confirms the notorious persistence of magical practices and beliefs in popular Christianity, and ξυστοφόρος might conceivably as well denote a military, as a priestly, function (cf. ἡγεμών, line 12). On 607, a *causa contentionis* ever since its publication by Roberts and Mattingly, this much may be added: it is not *per se* evidence of a currency devaluation; there must have been many 'pre-Budget' rumours circulating amongst the official hierarchy when a new government set itself to solve an economic crisis. 611 confirms Turner's view that non-citizens were drafted into *legio XXII* in the late first century.

The Archive of Theophanes (Part VI) deals mainly with the journey made to Syria between A.D. 317 and 323 by a *scholasticus* on the staff of the Prefect. Apart from the geographical information contained in the itineraries, it is most illuminating for the social and cultural background of the *haute bourgeoisie*, especially 624 with its picture of the rallying forces of Hellenic and pagan culture. 640-9, domestic accounts, disclose contemporary standards of living, and 627, an inventory of Theophanes' wardrobe, contains many rare and new words, mostly borrowed from Latin. Again, Jones's view that at this date Aegyptus Herculia consisted of the eastern Delta as well as Heptanomia (including the Arsinoite nome, cf. 659) is seen to be supported by 616, a taxation-list from Aegyptus Iovia, in which also appears our earliest example of the indication of 1,000-9,000 by a stroke to the left of the numeral.

Other Byzantine documents (Part VII) include 652, instructive for imperial bureaucratic methods, 654, showing *strategus* and *logistes* collaborating, clearly a transitional stage, and 657, where a *strategus* appears in A.D. 323-4. A similar conservatism in nomenclature is τόπος for παγός (655), unless earlier than A.D. 308. In their note on ἀνδρισμοῦ (658, 8) the editors have misinterpreted Preisigke, *WB*; the word occurs seven times in *PLond.v*. In Arab times (*PLond. iv*, *passim*) it means 'poll-tax', and its identification by Bell with the Byzantine διαγραφή has led to the view that the latter too was a kind of poll-tax. If this early-fourth-century example of ἀνδρισμός deliberately used in

antithesis to *iugatio* (ἀρουρηδόν) represents the Diocletianic *capitatio*, then it merits fuller discussion than the editors have given it.

Both editors and publishers are to be congratulated on the format and accuracy of *PRyl. iv*. True, the omission of vol. nos. in citing papyrological editions is an economy unlikely to be encouraged by those who have to read in large libraries. A few minor *corrigenda* are noted: οἰκόνομος, p. 19, para. 3, and Index VIII; 'PLond. iii, 1200, p. 12, l. 8' in 577, 12-13 n.; Παννί, 595, 57, *app. crit.*; 'Pharmouthi 2', p. 86, line 1 of translation; 'Empire', p. 108, paras. 1 and 3; συγκολλησιμός, p. 167, para. 2; ἔρρωσθαί σε, in 620, 625 (neither ref. in Index). Translation has been omitted without warning of 586, 13-18, καὶ τοὺς τόκους; 32, μείων. An amusing dittography has slipped in on p. xv, line 7, and there are occasions when the editors' practice in the matter of abbreviation does not agree with their precept.

University College of Wales, Aberystwyth

B. R. REES

HELLENISTIC CIVILIZATION

W. W. TARN, assisted by G. T. GRIFFITH: *Hellenistic Civilization*. Third Edition. Pp. xi+372; 4 maps. London: Arnold, 1952. Cloth, 25s. net.

IN this its third edition Sir William Tarn's classic work remains substantially unchanged both in letter and spirit. It still expresses, as he explains in his preface, his own individual views and interpretations, from some of which—the motives for Alexander's deification and Alexander's conception of a human brotherhood—his co-editor Mr. Griffith dissociates himself. The work of revision, for which Mr. Griffith is in a large measure responsible, has mainly consisted in alterations on specific points of fact and qualifications and changes of emphasis in general statements. Except in a few sections these changes do not strike the eye, but all scholars will be grateful for the painstaking scholarship which has gone to incorporating in the volume—or at least taking note of—the results of all recent discoveries and researches in the Hellenistic field.

One major revision concerns the Achaean League. Here the author and his co-editor have come down firmly (and in the reviewer's opinion rightly) for the view that the *σύνδοδος* and *σύγκλητος* were in theory merely regular and special meetings of the same body, the general assembly of all Achaeans over thirty, though in practice the *σύνδοδος* tended to be identical with the *βουλή*, which consisted of delegates from the cities. They also believe, though with justifiable hesitancy, that the *βουλή* was paid and therefore a fully democratic body. In assessing the comparative merits of the Achaean and Aetolian Leagues it might have been pointed out that while the Aetolians always dominated their fellow members—no non-Aetolian federal officer is on record—the Achaeans give actual as well as constitutional equality to new entrants, and the generals of the league were more often Sicyonian, Argive, or Arcadian than Achaean. Some description of the Lycian League, whose interesting institutions have been much studied of late, would have been a useful addition, especially as an important new inscription (*J.H.S.*, 1948, p. 46) has revealed that the league was a well-organized and vigorous body in the second century B.C.

The other main section which has been radically revised is that on the

Seleucids, where recent excavations, of which a list is given, have provided much new evidence, and some notable works of synthesis, including the author's *Bactria*, have been written. There are new paragraphs on the satrapies with their subdivisions, on the currency, on the relation of the kings to the old Greek cities, while the account of colonization has been drastically remodelled. Here the picture is clarified by a careful distinction between the city, always a royal foundation, and the military settlement (*κατοικία*) with its *κλήροι*; though the latter was often upgraded into a city, still retaining its *κλήροι*. Elsewhere the new version is less clear cut than the old, but probably closer to the diversity of the facts. There is still a tendency to idealize the Seleucids. We are told, for instance, that 'Antiochus IV used his wealth . . . to found or hellenize a new and considerable number of cities'; but it would be difficult to name a city that he founded *de novo*, and in the only case of a hellenized native town of which we have any evidence—Antioch in Jerusalem—it was the community which paid the king for their charter. When so much has been revised it is a pity that the author allows to stand the fanciful picture of primitive Asia Minor as a mosaic of 'temple states', derived from Sir William Ramsay. There is in fact no evidence of 'temple states', as opposed to temples owning a number of estates. Nor is there any evidence that the Seleucids confiscated sacred land in Asia Minor; of the references quoted, Strabo, p. 559, relates what Pompey and Pythodorus did to Zela, and *O.G.I.S.* 502 is now supplemented by another inscription which proves that the land in question, so far from being confiscated by kings had been given to Zeus of Aezami by Attalus and Prusias (see Broughton in *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History* (Princeton, 1951), pp. 236–50).

The reviewer noted only one misprint, 277 for 227 on p. 127. On p. 44 a curious slip has been allowed to stand—Cappadocia was annexed in A.D. 17, not under Vespasian. The book has been furnished with four useful maps, which would be even more useful if mountains and deserts had been marked with some form of light hatching.

Jesus College, Cambridge

A. H. M. JONES

ROMAN POLITICS

H. H. SCULLARD: *Roman Politics, 220–150 B.C.* Pp. xvi+325; 1 plate. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. Cloth, 25s. net.

IN 154 B.C., according to Piso the annalist and censor, Roman *pudicitia* was overthrown. The end of this decade was as good a point as any for the goal of Dr. Scullard's invaluable survey of a political scene which opens with the traditional grandeur of the Second Punic War: it is preferable to 167 B.C., the date suggested by his preface, for even without Livy the diverse pulls in Roman foreign policy must be studied down to the climax of the early forties, and the brief discussion of the causes of the final struggle with Carthage is as brilliant as anything in the book. Scullard has been generous. His appendixes include twenty-two crisp notes on critical problems, a larger discussion of the trials of the Scipios (in which he shows ground for retaining 187 as the date of Asiaticus' trial and for believing in a genuine trial of Africanus three years later), and, best of all, a full investigation into the speeches of Cato, in which most of the fragments are quoted *in extenso*.

Without in any way blurring the impartial and careful nature of his presentation Scullard has given general adherence to the views of F. Münzer (*Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien*—see also W. Schur, *Scipio Africanus*), according to which Roman politics were dominated by three groups, here labelled Fabian, Aemilian-Scipionic, and Claudio-Fulvian, the first conservative, the second normally more in touch with popular feeling, the third a 'middle group'. Historians would be grateful even if the book amounted to no more than a lucid version of Münzer, but many will also feel that in the course of the argument some at least of the numerous criticisms of the theory have been satisfactorily met. Of these one (see especially G. de Sanctis, *Riv. Fil.* 1936, 193) is based primarily on a reluctance to suppose that Roman senators of the period were prepared to indulge in selfish rivalries when the State was in danger. On this issue the testing-ground lies in the years 217 and 216, where Scullard shows convincingly how difficult it is to interpret the events recorded in Livy without believing in a senate divided against itself; he has also rebutted the doubts about the supposed Servilian intrigues in the critical though less desperate days of 203 to 201. It is true that, despite an admirably dispassionate appendix on sources, Scullard does not make it clear how far Livy was drawing for his account of elections on the second-century annalists, who would presumably have been familiar with the broad outlines of the political system. But those who wonder why an interpretation of events in terms of senatorial factions was unknown to Livy may fairly be asked whether the Livian tradition is anything like an adequate account of politics in later ages, when equally embarrassing questions might be put about the informed sources on which that tradition could draw.

But to support in principle the analysis of the Roman *factio* as it appears in Scullard's first chapter is very different from assenting to an account based on the particular three groups which Münzer evoked. A less rigid and more kaleidoscopic shifting of friendships and enmities might surely remove a number of the problems which have caused Scullard so much trouble. Of these the best example is the career of Flamininus. With three, and only three, groups to play with, Scullard is bound to revive the question whether Flamininus was a Fabian on account of his connexions, or a Scipionic on account of his Hellenism. In many respects his picture of this unstable personality is illuminating, but it may be that some of the labour is misconceived. The following are examples of other difficulties which might be lessened if party groupings were more flexible. In 210 B.C. the consul, Laevinus, behaved erratically for a Fulvio-Claudian, and the explanation on p. 210 seems a bit lame. In 192 no less than four plebeian candidates for the consulate are assigned to the Scipionic group. Earlier in that year L. Cornelius Merula had come under criticism from the consular Q. Metellus, supposedly a Scipionic like himself (pp. 122-3). In the seventies we are struck by the emergence of the Popillii and the Postumii: these are assigned to the Fulvian group, but one at least was at loggerheads with a Fulvius, Livy xl. 41. In 177 there was a violent quarrel between two Fulvians A. Manlius Vulso and C. Claudius Pulcher, a fact which passes without special comment on p. 188. Finally one is left with some feeling of surprise at the regularity with which the three groups took turns in predominance. On occasions special reasons are given for the rise of one and the fall of another, such as the defection of the Servilii to the Fulvians, the compact between M. Lepidus and M. Fulvius Nobilior which brought them to the

censorship of 179 (p. 180), or of course the career of Africanus. But too often the reasons why the People's favour wavered from one group to another remain obscure, this being perhaps especially the case in the middle period of the Second Punic War.

There remains, then, some doubt whether all the snares which beset the student of ancient 'parties' have been avoided. Scullard's account is anything but crude; but to suppose that a Fabian 'group' continued after the death of Cunctator makes it slightly reminiscent of the type of party which includes an Old Hickory in the substructure of its platform. Contortions of that kind are not obviously part of the essentials of the Roman political scene, whatever were the particular causes which much later produced the phenomenon of a 'Marianus homo'. This is in no way to doubt the importance which Scullard supposes the family to have played in Roman elections. But it may be worth suggesting once more one or two further considerations. First, a Roman *gens* would only emerge as a vigorous part of the electoral struggles when it had one or more candidates available for office. Secondly, the relationships, both of blood and of political indebtedness, existing among a small aristocracy were so numerous and complicated that the *gens* would have many from which to choose when a struggle was in prospect. Thirdly, the ephemeral interests, economic or political, which moved a particular candidate to pursue one or more of the alliances already open to him might well be different from those which moved his father or uncle a generation before. And fourthly, the career of Africanus may not be the only one in this period in which what may be dignified as political ideas, altruistic or otherwise, played a large part in deciding the *amicitiae* and *inimicitiae* which a politician contracted.

In this study Scullard has done much to pave the way for the full-dress biography of Cato which he rightly believes to be overdue. It is perhaps relevant here to say that the orthodox view which attributes the *Lex Villia Annalis* to the influence of *novi homines* (p. 174) is not beyond challenge. Under a system of *Leges Annales* the *novus homo* was bound to contend for office against a number of nobles competing *suo anno*, and it is not surprising that the normal result was that described by Cicero in (e.g.) *Leg. Agr.* ii. 3. If some of these nobles had been allowed to gain office earlier, the path of intruders might on occasions have been easier—though of course even if such an argument be valid, the *novi homines* may not have understood it.

To be worth its salt this book was bound to command dissent on particular topics. But whatever conclusions its readers reach they will always do so after seeing the evidence set out lucidly, fairly, and with penetration. As a book of reference it is unlikely to be superseded for many years to come.

Queen's College, Oxford

G. E. F. CHILVER

THE AUGUSTAN AGE

MARIO ATTILIO LEVI: *Il tempo di Augusto*. (Storichi antichi e moderni, N.S. 7.) Pp. x+510; 50 plates. Florence: La nuova Italia, 1951. Paper, L.3000.

THIS work and the author's contemporary edition of Suetonius' *Divus Augustus*, reviewed above (pp. 104-6), are intended to complement one another. The latter

presents Augustus the man, as he appears in Suetonius and the *Res Gestae*; this work deals rather, as the title states, with the age. The first two chapters, rewritten, Levi says, from his own *Ottaviano Capoparte* (1932) in the light of his maturer thought (p. 399), are largely a narrative of the years 44–30 B.C. The remaining six chapters deal with the constitutional, cultural, religious, social and economic, military and administrative, and provincial aspects of the principate of Augustus. There are 13 appendixes totalling 92 pages. The book is enriched by excellent photographs illustrating Augustan decorative art.

Space forbids a fuller account of the contents, but an attempt must be made to summarize the leading attitudes of the book. Levi asserts that in every society there is (1) a 'dominant class', and (2) a 'governing circle' of persons educated for rule, which acts in the interests of the dominant class, though often socially distinct from it. In Rome the old dominant class of small land-owners was gradually replaced by a new dominant class consisting mainly of the urban proletariat and professional soldiery. This made monarchy inevitable in the long run: but the governing circle of the *nobiles* (*optimates*) could not be displaced at once. During the last century of the Republic they were struggling to maintain their position against the ambitious individuals (*populares*) who led the new dominant class—struggling ineffectively, for to check one such leader they had to call in the aid of another, so that the issue was no longer between personal rule and the old oligarchy, but between rival aspirants to personal rule. Caesar victorious, it was vainly thought that his murder would restore the oligarchy; but its foundation, the old dominant class, was gone. However, since the final victory of Octavian was secured with the help of the *nobiles*, he was constrained to give them a share in the government which they retained till the Flavian era. The position of the Princeps in the State and his relation to the Senate is better expressed in such realistic terms than by abstract juridical forms such as Mommsen's dyarchy; and, valuable as recent prosopographical research has been, it does not clarify the nature of the basic change, since the persons discussed all belong to the governing circle.

The struggle may also be viewed as one between Roman exclusiveness and the culture and traditions of Greece. The *populares* saw in the Empire a trust bequeathed by Alexander, the great universalist, and a sphere for the unselfish diffusion of the benefits of peace and culture: the *nobiles* saw only a domain for exploitation. Similarly the main issue in Roman literary circles was whether Roman literature should develop in imitation of Greek or independently. In this as well as in the political sphere the tension was relaxed in the Augustan age, since the achievement of Vergil, Horace, and Livy satisfied both schools of thought.

Levi must take full credit for not having been satisfied with a superficial sketch of the agreed facts and a selection of probable interpretations. He has made a serious attempt to get behind the facts, and presents everywhere highly personal and stimulating opinions. It is the more disappointing to record that the book is rendered unbearably wearisome by its abstract and diffuse style. Anyone who doubts the propriety of such a criticism on the part of an English reviewer is recommended to see what he can make of the eighteen lines on p. 399 which begin 'In certo senso'; and he will not have to look far to find further examples of the same kind of writing, which in fact pervades the whole book. It generates such a confusion of mind that the reviewer is not even sure that he has not, in the above summary of Levi's thesis, at some points over-

simplified the argument in the cause of clarity. Often this vagueness in the use of words leads Levi into imprecision of thought, and even errors of fact, particularly in the field of constitutional theory. We are told, for example, that the *tribunicia potestas* would have been 'incompatible' (why?) with the triumviral power (p. 97); that the *cura annonae* of 22 B.C. 'rientrava pienamente nelle attribuzioni del titolare della *potestas auxilii ferendi populo* che era la maggiore caratteristica istituzionale della sua *auctoritas*' (p. 167); that, from the time of the Gracchi, the '*patrum auctoritas*' had been 'extended' to the equestrian order (p. 181). And what is the meaning of the sentence on p. 433 beginning 'Il fatto che Dione abbia abbandonato'?

It is characteristic that the word *nobiles*, so often used, is never defined, and seems to bear a narrower and a wider sense. Sometimes we read of the senatorial nobility (p. 146), sometimes of the senatorio-equestrian nobility (pp. 3, 67, 119; cf. p. 233, where it is asserted that Asinius Pollio was of noble family). Conversely, the new 'dominant class' sometimes includes only the urban proletariat and the troops (pp. 145 f.), sometimes also the traders, financiers, etc. (p. 484). The fact is that there is no place for the equestrian order in either the 'governing circle' or the 'dominant class' described by Levi. We know from prosopography that from the time of the Gracchi, if not before, the Senate was subject to continual infiltration, largely from the equestrian order, with the result that by Flavian times the noble families of the Republic had almost disappeared. If Levi reckons the *equites* among the '*nobiles*', it will follow that the '*nobiles*' continued to furnish the governing circle as long as this latter was recruited from the senatorial and equestrian orders; if with the proletariat, etc., how can he maintain that the new 'dominant class' remained unrepresented in the 'governing circle' until the Flavian era? We may add that Levi does not in this book attempt to prove that the new 'dominant class' consisted essentially of the urban proletariat and the army, but assumes it as self-evident.

It is all the more difficult to grasp and check Levi's conclusions because the text is without documentation. The appendixes do not fill this gap: except in small measure, they extend, without elucidating, the text. Some of them are indeed 'bibliographies', but of a highly personal kind explicitly intended (p. 483) to make clear Levi's own attitude to the subject. The whole burden of proof is laid on the reader. Nor will he find, if he forces himself to take this burden up, that Levi's method of presentation is justified by an absence of error. The following is a selection: the *lex Saenia* conferred *ensoria potestas* upon Octavian and thus enabled him to create patricians (p. 150); in 30 B.C. Octavian received 'the tribunician power with its inherent rights extended to cover the zone included in the *pomerium*, that is all Italy' (p. 150); the *princeps senatus* was president of the Senate (p. 156); Q. Aemilius [M.' f.] Lepidus, *cos.* 21 B.C., was 'probably' son of the triumvir (p. 170); Arvals had to be patricians (pp. 257, 259); the annual consumption of grain in Italy was 150 million quintals (p. 278)—this implies a daily consumption per head of 6 lb., since the total population was 14-17 million (p. 329); the *latus* and *angustus clavus* were worn on the *toga* (p. 339)—they were in fact worn on the *tunica*; the decisions of the *semenstre consilium* had the force of *senatus consulta* (pp. 342-4)—in fact only during the last year of Augustus' life; Egypt exported ship-timber (p. 283).

A further indication of Levi's standards of presentation is that there are at

least 100 misprints, wrong references, mistaken names, and misquotations. It is, on the other hand, merely an irritating practice rather than in error that Levi often refers to Augustus after 27 B.C. as 'Ottaviano', and sometimes even as 'Ottaviano Augusto'.

Space does not permit adequate discussion of the appendixes, but their contents may be briefly indicated. Nos. 1-5 illustrate contentions in the text; 6 is a not unhelpful discussion of Dio's sources in which, however, occurs twice (pp. 424, 431 f.) the astounding assertion that Dio departs most clearly from the Livian tradition in describing the defeat of Varus (cf. pp. 411 f., where it is stated that Livy was Dio's principal source for Books xli to lvii). Nos. 7-9 are concerned with the concept of *auctoritas*, for which the author believes the possession of auspices was a necessary pre-condition. The argument is often hard to follow, and might have been stiffened with an admixture of the 'abstract juridical' approach which Levi regrets in Mommsen (p. 483); for example, what are we to make of the view (p. 445) that the promagistrate and *privatus cum imperio* have no *potestas*? Nos. 10-12 are bibliographies (see above). No. 13 is largely a restatement of Levi's main position.

To avoid ending on a wholly condemnatory note, the reviewer must repeat that this book, with all its faults, contains much valuable thought. If it cannot be recommended for general reading, it should stir to fruitful effort those whose interest in Augustan studies equals Levi's, and whose patience survives its 500 pages. Had the book been compressed into one-third of the space, the number of such persons would have been raised proportionately.

University of Edinburgh

T. J. CADOUX

ROME AND EGYPT

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON: *Egypt and the Roman Empire*. (Jerome Lectures, Second Series.) Pp. vii+183. Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Cloth, 28s. net.

THE six lectures (given on the Thomas Spencer Jerome Foundation) assembled in this book are concerned with economic and social questions. It is a field in which the writer has laboured assiduously. That he has made it his business to classify and organize a disparate mass of material is a service for which the reviewer is sincerely grateful, and for which he would like to express his gratitude here too. Johnson's *Roman Egypt* (1936) did this for the papyri of the first three Roman centuries, while collaboration with L. C. West produced in *Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt* (1944) a correlation of the coins and the papyri, and in *Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies* (1949) a collection and discussion of the economic evidence for the Byzantine Empire. These preliminary studies are the basis of the present lectures. The first two chapters summarize the principal arguments and conclusions of *Currency*, the other four derive from *Byzantine Egypt*. Johnson addresses a general audience, but expects a great deal of co-operation from it. His statements are not always clear and precise, and there is some repetitiveness.

Neither unity of theme nor the intention of the title is clear at first sight. Johnson does not make a critical examination of the impact on Rome of Egyptian ideas and systems, or use Egyptian data, after isolating what is

individual in them, to illuminate the working of the empire. The reader at first supposes that the title means no more than that the writer is studying Egypt as a part of the empire, and will use comparative material when it suits him. In the last two chapters light dawns. Johnson has been building up the view that the conditions of life were better in the Byzantine Empire, especially for the peasant, than either in Egypt itself at earlier periods, or in other parts of the contemporary Roman world. In chapter 3, 'Land Tenure', a case is presented for believing that early in the fourth century 'possession of all lands within its territory was transferred to the village' (p. 104). What was gained by the change from tenancy to proprietorship was the more important in that, as Johnson holds, the imperial legislation against the extension of estates was effective. 'There is no clear proof that any one proprietor had acquired possession of vast areas as in the West. . . . Side by side with the large estate, whatever its nature may have been, there were a large number of peasant proprietors in the villages' (p. 86). In chapter 4, 'Serfdom in Byzantine Egypt', Johnson refuses to interpret terms in the papyri, such as γεωργὸς ἐναπόγραφος, from the Codes, and concludes that 'in no case can their tenants (on the estates of Olybrius or Apion) be described as having the status of slaves of the soil'. Chapter 5, 'Taxation in Byzantine Egypt', summarizes the systems and changes of seven centuries. From the tax register of Antaeopolis Johnson argues that the peasant's total tax under Justinian would have been equivalent to 13 artabas of wheat as compared to 33 artabas under Augustus (p. 123). 'Since the peasant enjoyed a reasonably low rate of taxation in comparison with his burdens in the earlier period of foreign domination, it is our belief that the Egyptian of the Byzantine period experienced greater economic prosperity and social independence than in any other period of his history' (p. 131). In a final chapter entitled 'The Administration of Egypt' it is argued that the administrative machinery created by Diocletian was even less a burden than that of the early empire.

Concentration on the welfare of the peasant (thereby omitting much that was characteristic of the Byzantine system) can be justified on the ground that Egypt's wealth lay in her agriculture, and the peasant class formed the majority of the population. But is this favourable and unorthodox picture of his condition acceptable? In a short review it seems preferable to regard the whole rather than quarrel with details, and it may therefore be asked whether the author has not taken too partial a view of the coherence of his evidence. He is in general aware of its limitations in reliability, and in time and place: papyri are often torn at the crucial point, and in spite of their enormous numbers, they come from relatively few sites in Egypt. Only Oxyrhynchus has provided a series extending through all the seven centuries involved in this book, while even there the documents of the fifth century are too few to maintain continuity. Direct statistical comparison for the same place at different periods is therefore rarely, if ever, possible. The ideal aim of the economic investigator is, no doubt, to organize the papyri so as to form a closed body of coherent evidence, interpretable from themselves alone, a body that can be set in opposition to other bodies of evidence such as the Codes. This high aim has not been realized in this book, if indeed it is realizable.

Criticisms in detail have been made by H. I. Bell (*C.R.* lxiv. 137-9 and *J.R.S.* xl. 123 ff.). To the reviewer it seems also that some relevant evidence among the papyri has not been given sufficient weight. Two illustrations may

be given drawn from the Abinnaeus archive in the all-important fourth century. (1) Even if it is assumed that the peasant becomes proprietor of his land, and the amount of taxation is lower than formerly, how much of his surplus do grasping collectors and an unscrupulous soldiery allow him to retain? The president of the senate of Arsinoë writes thus to Abinnaeus c. A.D. 340-50: 'You sent to Theoxenis the soldiers under your command and you dragged the villagers away although so many outrages have been committed in the village. For you know that the house of Hatres was looted . . . and cattle have been driven off, and you did not permit inquiry to be made for them, but carried them off as if there were no laws' (P. Lond. 408). (2) If the administration is unable to guarantee security of property the practical man looks for a champion. 'The robberies and exactions practised here and now by men of higher station it is the custom of your manliness to stop' begins a petitioner in P. Lond. 238. This type of language begins, in the third century, to replace the earlier straightforward statements of grievance (as if the petitioner trusted that a wrong had only to be stated in order to be righted) and continues to grow in fulsomeness. It should be noted also that the word *δεσπότης* in the address (which continues after the constitution of A.D. 415 forbade the name 'patron') is found 14 times in these letters to 10 occurrences of *πάτρων*. In such a state of society, protection (sought from either landlord or soldier—both alternatives in P. Lond. 411) is the first consideration, whatever price must be paid for it.

There is no space to discuss the first two chapters, but I add a note on P. Baden 37. Johnson writes (p. 22): 'Whatever its interpretation may be, the letter is important because it presents two *facts* (italics mine). One is that there was a free market for gold, which it was in the power of the prefect to control; and the other is the first mention of officials chosen by lot in charge of the revenues.' But the published text of this papyrus (reproduced in *Currency*, p. 181, without the tell-tale dots) runs as follows:

10 ἐνέτυχον δὲ αὐτῶι οἱ τὸ προσ-
[οδο]νομη[ε]ον λα[χ]όντες, ὧν καὶ ἡ προ{σ}θεσμία
[παρ]ε[ι]λήλυθη

The papyrus is badly rubbed, and *προσοδονομῶν* is clearly the merest guess of Schubart's; it is unlikely to be right, for the word is not attested elsewhere (nor, apparently, is *προσόδους νέμειν*), and it requires a false word-division at the end of the line, while the following word λα[χ]όντες is just as likely to be λα[β]όντες. The restoration has, therefore, no evidential value at all.

On p. 171 I am made to usurp credit for a restoration which should go to Mr. E. B. Turner.

University College, London

E. G. TURNER

ROMAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson. Edited by P. R. COLEMAN-NORTON. Pp. xiii+373; 8 plates. Princeton: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Cloth, 32s. 6d. net.

THE essays here presented to Professor A. C. Johnson cover, like his own work, a wide field. I group them so far as possible by subject, although in the book

itself they are grouped chronologically. The largest single group is that dealing with problems of Roman numismatics. This includes articles by the late J. G. Milne on the silver and bronze coinage of the Hellenistic period (with particular reference to the passage of Festus 359 M.); by A. R. Bellinger on the early coinage of Roman Syria (which is in a way a continuation of his valuable earlier article dealing with the historical interpretation of late Seleucid issues, 'The End of the Seleucids', *Connect. Acad. Arts*, xxxviii, 1949, pp. 51-102); by M. Grant on 'A Step towards World Coinage', in which he considers particularly the issues of c. 19 B.C. from the mints of Pergamum (and perhaps Samos), Rome, and a mint which he claims to be Gaulish; by H. Mattingly on 'The Clash of the Coinages, 270-296', in which he discusses evidence for possible resistance to the monetary reform of Aurelian, described by Zosimus, supporting his argument by a detailed analysis of coin-hoards. In the same field L. C. West, familiar as a collaborator of Professor Johnson in work on Roman and Byzantine Egypt, studies the coinage of Diocletian in relation to the edict on prices, while Professor Alföldi in 'The Initials on the Helmet of Constantine' returns to a subject which has occupied him on other occasions.

Another group of articles is concerned with the economic history of the Imperial provinces. An article by C. H. Coster on 'The Economic Position of Cyrenaica' utilizes the ancient evidence from Herodotus to Synesius, in giving a general survey of the subject, but his handling of the Imperial period is less satisfactory than that of the earlier periods. The late M. P. Charlesworth summarizes knowledge of Roman trade with India in the light of recent discoveries and work in this field (I may note in this connexion another article in the same field in a place where it might pass unnoticed: that by J. Ph. Vogel, in *Archaeologica Orientalia in mem. E. Herzfeld* (New York, 1952), pp. 226-34, 'Ptolemy's Geography of India'). T. S. R. Broughton gives a valuable criticism of current views on the policy of Hellenistic kings towards the temple-estates of Asia Minor, based mainly on the interpretation of the bilingual inscription from Aezani published shortly before the war by G. Jacopi. Also to be noted in this field is J. Day's estimate of the historical value of Dio Chrysostom's Euboean Oration (vii); this gives a useful and thorough survey of the mercantile activity of the Euboean cities both in the Hellenistic and the Roman periods: on the coinage of Histiaea (p. 233) see now L. Robert, *Étud. Num. Grecq.*, pp. 178-216. David Magie, the doyen of the students of Roman Asia Minor, offers a brief note on corn-exaction at Cibyra, as attested by *I.G.R.*, iv. 914, proposing to read $\pi\rho\tilde{\alpha}(\xi)\nu$ for the $\pi\rho\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$ of the copy (line 14)—a change which I find difficult to accept. Finally, for the later period, there is G. Downey's article on 'The Economic Crisis at Antioch under Julian the Apostate'. More strictly Roman in theme are G. F. Duckworth's 'Wealth and Poverty in Roman Comedy' (see now the same author's large work, *The Nature of Roman Comedy*, Princeton Univ. Press, 1952) and Miss L. R. Taylor's examination of the relationship between the agrarian legislation of Iulius Caesar in his first consulate and the Lex Mamilia Roscia Peducaea Alliena Fabia (Riccobono, *F.I.R.*² 12), in which she attacks the view set forth by H. Rudolph in his *Staat und Stadt im römischen Italien* (1935).

Among other miscellaneous articles on a variety of subjects—A. E. Raubitschek on 'Sylleia' (containing the first publication of a victory-herm from the Agora, mentioning the $\Sigma\upsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha$), P. R. Coleman-Norton on 'The Apostle Paul and the Roman Law of Slavery', W. K. Prentice on 'James, the Brother

of the Lord', R. Syme on 'Tacfarinas, the Musulamii and Thubursicu', A. Piganiol on 'Le Calendaire brontoscope de Nigidius Figulus' (see also, on this same topic, S. Weinstock in *P.B.S.R.*, xix (1951), pp. 122 ff., 'The Libri Fulgurales'), C. B. Welles's valuable article on 'The Population of Roman Dura' (from which we learn of the active preparation by Professor Welles of 'Parchments and Papyri of Dura-Europos'), A. E. R. Boak's publication of two papyri (which incidentally fix the date of the Prefectship of Iulius Iulianus to A.D. 314), relating to the village officials of Egypt in the fourth century A.D., known as *tessararii* and *quadrarii*, and P. Charanos's interesting article on 'The Aristocracy of Byzantium in the 13th Century'—I note, as of outstanding importance, H. C. Youtie's masterly reinterpretation of a papyrus in Heidelberg (*S.B.* 7551). This admirable example of careful yet radical criticism and reconstruction of both content and 'architecture' (to borrow a word from the epigraphical vocabulary) of an accepted text should be studied carefully by all whose work lies, or will lie, in the interpretation of documents.

On the whole, then, a rich and stimulating volume, well produced. One complaint, however, I may be allowed to lodge: the title of the book on the spine, reads 'Studies in Roman Economic and Social History | Coleman-Norton'. Mr. Coleman-Norton as chief editor must certainly be allowed his full meed of honour, but librarians, bibliographers, and students alike will regret that there is no reference to the 'Jubilar' on the spine.

Brasenose College, Oxford

P. M. FRASER

PATAVIUM

CESIRA GASPAROTTO: *Padova Romana*. Pp. 191; 74 figs. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, n.d. (?1951). Paper, L. 2000.

THE masterly paper of P. Fraccaro on centuriation (*Studi in onore di E. Ciaceri*, 100–23) and the continuous results of excavation, particularly in the University area, make a new monograph on Patavium most desirable, and this book contains a valuable summary of the archaeological evidence. Patavium was a prosperous Venetian city which was perhaps gaining at the expense of Ateste even as early as the third century B.C.; its exceptional primacy of the Po district in Augustan times was perhaps short lived (the reviewer developed an argument to this effect in *Cisalpine Gaul*, 54 ff.); but what the author shows is that the dock buildings off the river and probably also the amphitheatre confirm the literary evidence for continued wealth and population, perhaps on a lesser scale, in the later part of the first century A.D. There is therefore no reason to assume that the decay was catastrophic as at Ateste or, for different reasons, at Cremona; and, as was always known, Patavium was a flourishing town in the later Empire. The remains of a probable Mithraeum (p. 125) should also be noted; and there is a sensible discussion of the end of Patavium in the Lombard period and the flight to the lagoons (pp. 34 f.).

The author follows the plan, familiar in works of this type, of beginning with an historical summary (pp. 9–78) and then passing to detailed presentation of the material remains and the evidence for centuriation and boundaries. This tends to give the impression that the history is a mere introduction to the archaeological study rather than that the finds are, as they undoubtedly should

be, the essential prelude to any solid reconstruction of Patavium's history. Nor is it always obvious which of the material evidence is new and how much it can be used to prove. This is regrettable, because the work is painstaking and has at its command a large bibliography, especially of local works not always accessible in countries outside Italy. It is surprising, for instance, that after a careful attempt to trace the line of Patavium's *pomerium* there is no estimate of the population which at different times may have lived either inside or outside the line, nor indeed any absolute calculation of the area which the line enclosed. Moreover, apart from Ateste and an occasional reference to Aquileia, the economic and cultural life of Patavium seems to be viewed too much in isolation from the other towns of north Italy.

The famous sons of this town are a formidable task to the writer of a short study. The author was probably wise in avoiding any fresh diagnosis of what Pollio meant by 'Patavinitas', but she devotes some pages to arguing that Livy derived from his home both a dramatic power which is shown in the plastic art of Augustan Venetia and also that spirit of austere tolerance which led his city to escape internal troubles and to institute the college of *Concordiales* as a symbolic contribution to the problems of the classes coming to the fore. There was perhaps too little room for all this; and incidentally there is no allusion to the special features of the north Italian *sevirate* as a whole, of which the Patavine *Concordiales* (the juniors of the *seviri* and *Augustales*) are certainly an interesting example. The discussion of Thræsea and his circle is not adequately based on recent studies of either Roman philosophy or of Pliny's letters. Among the Patavine poets the author is by no means to be discouraged from including Valerius Flaccus on the strength of Martial i. 61 and 76, the only solid grounds for the frequently repeated view to the contrary being the *cognomen* Setinus and the apparent poverty of the poet in the second epigram (see Schanz-Hosius, ii, p. 520): do these grounds really require one to believe in another Flaccus of the mid-eighties of sufficient distinction to enter the galaxy of i. 61? It is distressing, however, that the Patavine connexions of Silius Italicus (see *Cisalpine Gaul*, 109 ff.) are entirely ignored. Of other Asconii a mention of 'the consul L. Asconius Pedianus recorded by Pliny with his colleague Sex. Pompeius' is unexplained by reference or context, but the identification of the Asconius Labeo of Tacitus, *Annals* xiii. 10 with the *pontifex* of *C.I.L.* v. 2848 is almost certainly right.

Despite a corrigendum slip (which tells us to read Niebhur for Niebher) the spelling of Latin and foreign words is deplorable. There are also some very questionable statements about general historical matters, for instance on p. 29 where it might appear that the Lex Roscia of 49 B.C. was the culmination of a period in which Caesar had been extensively founding colonies in the Po valley. But it is for the later portion that this book will be chiefly valued, and its illustrations are most commendable. The inscription of Fig. 28 (see also pp. 42, 48, and 58 n. 22) appears to be otherwise unpublished.

GREEK SCULPTURE

GEORG LIPPOLD: *Die Griechische Plastik*. (Handbuch der Archäologie, VI. iii. 1.) Pp. xxviii+441; 136 plates. Munich: Beck, 1950. Paper, DM. 62.

THIS handbook on Greek sculpture to 30 B.C. is carefully planned and executed. It is divided into three parts, for the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods; each part is divided into chapters for the successive phases of the period; each chapter is divided into sections for the local schools of the phase; and each section is divided into shorter passages for such topics as particular sculptors, single large monuments, reliefs, and portraits. This plan has drawbacks. First, though there is a brief and usually good characterization of the phase in the paragraphs that introduce each chapter, the general development is obscured by the piecemeal exposition. Secondly, to distinguish local schools is (as admitted on pp. 5-6) a hazardous exercise, since already in the Archaic period sculptors travelled widely; and in the later periods, when we rely largely on copies, it needs faith to detect local as opposed to individual and provincial differences: it is significant that such notable originals as the Artemision god and the Zeus with Ganymede from Olympia elude our author's classification. But in practice Lippold relies hardly more on style than on sculptors' ethnics, recorded in signatures and literary sources or inferred from the places in which their works were set up. This preoccupation with sculptors is emphasized by the first index, which lists—fairly comprehensively I imagine—some 575 names: here it is salutary to remember that only a dozen or so original Greek statues survive which can reasonably be identified with works mentioned in our literary records (see F. Brommer, *Gymnasium*, 1952, 115-25).

Within this plan the allotment of space is admirable. Classical has twice as much as Hellenistic or Archaic, and the subdivisions are fairly proportioned. Unfortunately the book was delayed in publication: Lippold completed his text in 1935, and the revision which continued till 1949 evidently consisted rather of small alterations than of large replacements. But this does not excuse the weakness and confusion of the Archaic part. The discussion of the origins of Greek sculpture is perfunctory; local schools are emphasized and types, for instance, are neglected, so that it is not till p. 41 that the 'kouros' is defined; H. G. Payne's account of Attic (*Archaic Marble Sculpture*: 1936) is hardly used; and the long period 700-480 B.C. is divided only at 550 B.C. However, there is now a good account of Archaic sculpture in G. Karo's *Greek Personality in Archaic Sculpture*. For the maturer art of the Classical and Hellenistic periods Lippold has more sympathy and he takes proper notice of recent studies. There are of course controversial statements, and perhaps some of his Hellenistic dates are higher than is commonly supposed, but in general his judgements here are sane and his learning, as the footnotes show, is very wide.

I comment on a few random points. P. 104: it is hard to believe that pl. 33. 2 gives the Argive canon of proportions before Polyclitus. P. 154: my impression is that in England at least the sculptures of the Parthenon influenced (and beneficially) many public monuments of the nineteenth century. P. 165: Rumpf's cogent argument (which Lippold accepts) that the Idolino is classifying and not classical is not yet widely enough known. P. 183: did the his-

torical events mentioned by Lippold demonstrably control the development of sculpture at Athens? P. 217: Antiphanes, to judge by his commissions, felt no local ties. P. 327, l. 4: the reference is to p. 313. Pp. 384-5: on the Laocoon see now G. M. A. Richter, *Three Critical Periods in Greek Sculpture*, 66-70.

In any history of art the plates are important. Here Lippold has chosen his subjects well, noted the size below each figure, and in the table of contents given further details and references, though neither there nor always in the text does he mention the extent of restoration. But the illustrations are much too small—on an average $3\frac{1}{4} \times 2$ inches—and too many are reproduced from inferior photographs. So they serve more to remind than to instruct the reader.

There is a helpful table of contents. The bibliographies that appear throughout the text are useful, though uncritical. The index of sculptures is very sensibly by museums. The cross-referencing is good. The style is clear and mercifully sparing of abstract expression.

In summary, this is a valuable book of reference for specialists. It is not suitable—and perhaps is not intended—as a general introduction to the study of Greek sculpture.

Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge

R. M. COOK

YALE CLASSICAL STUDIES

Yale Classical Studies. Volume Twelve. Pp. 265; 2 plates. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Cloth, 25s. net.

H. N. PORTER on 'The Early Greek Hexameter' extends and revises the work of E. G. O'Neill in *Yale Studies*, viii. He treats the hexameter as a system of cola, normally four to each line, which are delimited by caesurae, and each of which is normally a 'unit of meaning'. By caesurae he means word-divisions within the line; for though, according to the experimentalists, these have no phonetic reality, they produce a psychological effect, and provide essential modifications of the underlying metrical pattern. The division of cola in *Iliad* i. 2 is the normal type. This, with seven common and three rare variations, is analysed in twenty-four tables of statistics based on 6,025 lines dating from Homer to Callimachus. The traditional rules about caesura and diaeresis seem to fit comfortably enough into this scheme of 'colometric organization'.

Statistical austerity deepens further with the article of M. G. Goggin on 'Rhythm in the Prose of Favorinus'. It is the *Περὶ φωνῆς* of this sophist of the second century A.D. (published from a papyrus in 1931) which is the chief object of analysis. Mathematical equations are used for proving that Favorinus consciously sought after certain quantitative rhythmical patterns both at the ends of sentences and at divisions of thought within the sentence. The authoress seems to admit that this type of argument is 'dangerous and uncertain'. I feel sure that some simpler principle or principles would explain Favorinus' proceedings. She quotes incidentally [Longinus] 39. 4, contriving to increase the obscurity of that passage by interpreting 'dactylic' as referring to the spondee ὄσπερ.

M. E. Taylor writes on 'The Development of the Quod Clause'. The development is from the pronominal to the conjunctive uses of *quod*, and her

account of it is based on a study of over 5,000 sentences from authors ranging from Plautus to Tacitus.

A. R. Bellinger continues his descriptions of Greek coins in the Yale collection.

The two remaining articles are of considerable literary interest. C. W. Mendell on 'The Influence of the Epyllion on the *Aeneid*' accepts the admittedly modern term 'epyllion' as meaning a short poem in hexameter verse which tells a story. He argues that the influence of the neoterics upon Virgil is illustrated by Virgil's conscious imitation, in certain episodes of the *Aeneid*, of the elaborate symmetry practised by Catullus in the *Peleus and Thetis*, and, in particular, of Catullus' technique of inserting a story within a story. In 'Marcus Argentarius: A Poet of the Greek Anthology', S. G. P. Small discusses the date, versification, language, and structure of the thirty-seven epigrams ascribed to this author who illustrates the growing fondness for the 'surprise conclusion' and thus foreshadows Martial. He adds a text of the epigrams, with notes which are very useful on the whole for the study of a versifier so fond of puns and other conceits, and so much given to the imitation of his forerunners. This, like the article of Miss Goggin, is an abbreviated Ph.D. thesis. Hence perhaps a tendency to suck the evidence dry, and to waste breath on trivial matters; the citations of parallel passages could well have been pruned—on the fleeting quality of youth it is scarcely necessary to refer the reader to 'R. Herrick *passim*'.

University of Sheffield

J. TATE

SOME SCHOOL BOOKS

1. H. G. LORD: *A Structural Latin Course*. Book I. Pp. 272; 25 photographs, 5 drawings. London: University of London Press, 1951. Cloth, 6s. 6d.

2 and 3. PAUL CROUZET: *Nouvelle Méthode Latine*. Pp. xiii+390; 8 pp. of photographs, numerous drawings. *Nouvelle Grammaire Latine*. Pp. xx+150. Paris: Marcel Didier, 1951. Boards, 800, 450 fr.

4. WILLIAM R. MURIE: *Lanx Saturata*. Pp. 28. London and Glasgow: Blackie, 1952. Paper, 1s.

5. J. M. MILNE: *An Anthology of Classical Latin*. Pp. vii+208. London and Glasgow: Blackie, 1952. Boards, 5s. 6d.

1. MR. LORD's book is not just another Latin Course; it takes the simple but novel line of approach through English Grammar, and this side-by-side treatment should go far to remove the mutual recriminations of Latin and English teachers over the grammatical ignorance of their respective pupils. The emphasis on graphic analysis first at each new stage discloses many of the common pitfalls, e.g. the case of indirect object, and a well-chosen vocabulary ensures interest in the passages for translation. The whole is carefully graded, introducing subordinate clauses after 70 pages and ending with Supines, Participles, and Gerunds. The 'background' information is brief, but clear and instructive, and an unusual selection of illustrations should keep alive the interest of any pupil.

2 and 3. M. Crouzet's two books are interesting principally for the study of comparative methods of teaching Latin. His *nouvelle méthode* starts with the avowed object of showing the literary heritage bequeathed to French from Latin and claims to be a reasoned answer to the questions, so often posed in this country, 'Pourquoi le latin et pourquoi ses règles?' Like Mr. Lord he keeps both languages side by side throughout, but puts more stress on the value of Latin for the formation of a good literary style in his own language. The usual method of Oral Exercise, Translation (from original authors as soon as possible), and Composition is followed, and the Grammar shows little variation from the traditional model. One unusual feature is the regular explanation of characteristics of Latin which by transference lend power and clarity to the French tongue. M. Crouzet is an enthusiast and supports his case with frequent quotations from great authors in both languages; one hopes that his oft-repeated clarion call to the study of Latin will not go unheeded in his own country.

4. Mr. Murie's little collection of test papers is designed for the revision of general Latin knowledge for the Scottish equivalent of the Ordinary level of the G.C.E. The questions are divided in a 3-to-5 ratio between linguistic and 'background' subjects and cover a wide area; some may even give pause to experienced teachers. The inclusion of a number of proverbial sayings suggests that in Scotland the quotation of a Latin tag is still far from a dying art, but there are two errata among the historical and literary questions; the Duilius (p. 28) should presumably be Gaius, the admiral of 261, not Marcus, as stated, and the author of 'Graecia capta ferum . . .' is surely not 'a Greek writer' but Horace in the *Epistles*.

5. This anthology, intended for pupils with several years' study behind them, would make a useful reader for those who need Latin, but not as a main subject. The editor has wisely allowed his choice of passages to be influenced by their aesthetic merits and several he has starred for learning by heart. Of the seven authors Virgil is allotted 30 pages, Cicero 25, Livy and Ovid 14 each, Horace 5, Catullus 3, and Sallust 2. A short account of his life and literary characteristics introduces each author, and besides a general vocabulary there are special vocabularies and very brief notes, giving adequate information, which is on the whole accurate, though the Latin equivalent of 'Eumenides' (p. 144) is Furiae, not Parcae.

Monkton Combe School

M. EDWARDS

SHORT REVIEWS

MILOŠ N. GJURIĆ: *Istorija Helenske Književnosti*. Pp. 745; 1 plate, 41 text figs. Belgrade: Naučna Knjiga, 1951. Cloth, 700 dinars.

THIS is the first instalment of a two-volume history of Greek literature, written primarily for students of Belgrade University. It covers the period before Alexander the Great: the

second volume will appear shortly and will carry on the story into Hellenistic and Roman times. Within the period treated, arrangement is by literary genres.

A book of this kind—especially when it is also of this size—is bound to be largely a work of compilation. Dr. Gjurić is on the whole a good compiler. Conflicting views are stated clearly and fairly—a good example is

the treatment of the Homeric question in modern times on pp. 98-105—and each section is accompanied by a full, though sometimes rather uncritical, bibliography, which is particularly welcome as it contains many items in Slavonic languages which are so often passed over by western European bibliographers.

Yet the author has curious blind spots: in the section on Thucydides (pp. 429-56) there is no discussion of the problem of unity or of the authenticity of the speeches; and in the section on comedy (pp. 355-79) the various kinds of comic performance known in the Greek world are faithfully described one after another, but the crucial question of the origin of Attic comedy as a literary form is not treated. There are many signs of hasty and loose composition, and one has the impression that the author has underestimated the difficulty of recasting his lectures—on which the book is based—in the form of a work of reference.

Dr. Gjurić is an authority on Serbian epic poetry, on which he has published many studies since 1912. One therefore turns with particular interest to the pages in which he examines the features common to the Serbian epic and the Homeric poems (pp. 52-64). The material presented is hardly accessible elsewhere: yet it is disappointing to find that Dr. Gjurić does not go on from disconnected lists of motifs to an examination of the nature of the two societies and of the development and role of epic poetry in them.

It would be easy to go on cataloguing shortcomings. If we would see things in their right proportion, it would be well to bear in mind that it is more than seventy years since a history of Greek literature on this scale was written in English, and more than sixty since one was written in French. Dr. Gjurić's book is a remarkable achievement, and well worth consultation by those who can read Serbo-Croat.

ROBERT BROWNING

University College, London

MEINRAD SCHELLER: *Die Oxytonierung der griechischen Substantiva auf -ā*. Pp. vi+146. Zürich: Dissertationsdruckerei Leemann A.G., 1951. Paper.

DR. SCHELLER's investigation of the oxytone substantives in *-ā* leads him to conclude that they represent, not an inherited type formally distinct from those in *-ā̄*, but the result of a phonetic development. He supposes that by the late classical period *-ā* was already

pronounced *-ā* (with consonantal *ι*), and that for some words the oxytone accent of the popular pronunciation established itself as standard. The existence of such 'vertical borrowing' from popular speech into the standard language is illustrated from modern languages, especially German. A detailed study of the relevant vocabulary shows that semantically the substantives in *-ā* form one class with those in *-ā̄*; the much higher proportion of substantives with concrete or collective meaning among the latter is explained by their more popular and everyday character. The evidence for the early consonantization of *ι* is then reviewed, and statements of grammarians discussed. Dr. Scheller notices in passing many interesting points: for example, the possibility of a contrary change *-ā̄*, *-ēā* to *-ā̄*, *-ēā* in some of the modern dialects.

Apart from the detailed considerations on which it rests, Dr. Scheller's explanation has the merit of keeping in view types of linguistic development well known from living languages. The author would be the last to claim that no difficulties or improbabilities remain. It is, for example, easily conceivable that in a word like *σποδιά* the popular pronunciation with consonantal *ι* could have become so general as to impose its oxytone accentuation on the standard trisyllabic pronunciation even in the recitation of Homeric poetry. It is difficult, on the other hand, to see why this should have occurred in cases like *ἐσχατιά*, *πατριά*, *στρατιά*.

The occurrence of a few printers'-errors and the omission of *σποδιά* from the word-index do nothing to impair the impression of careful scholarship which is customary from the school of Professor Manu Leumann.

D. M. JONES

Westfield College, London

DAVID TABACHOVITZ: *Homerische εἰ-Σätze*. Eine sprachpsychologische Studie. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen, 8°, III.) Pp. 156. Lund: Gleerup, 1951. Paper, Kr. 20.

DR. TABACHOVITZ's book is an attack on the prevailing view, succinctly put in the first sentence of his introduction, 'dass der konditionale Nebensatz im Griechischen auf einen Hauptsatz zurückzuführen und dieser primitive Zustand bei Homer noch deutlich zu verspüren sei'. There are two propositions here, which the author does not, however keep apart in his treatment. He denies both

but his method of proof touches only the second. From mainly stylistic considerations he shows that the Homeric *ei*-clause need not, and in general should not, give the impression of a subordination less developed than in Attic. The nuances of wish, exhortation, interrogation, and the like, which to Lange and his followers seemed clues to the origin of the conditional period, are seen by Tabachovitz as secondary acquisitions from the situational context. Here it is that he invokes *Sprachpsychologie* to account for (*inter alia*) *ei* interrogative, the use of *μή* to negative the protasis, the independent *ei γάρ*-clause of wish, which is after all, it appears, to be explained as due to the suppression of an apodosis (the difficulty of *εἴθε* is noted but hardly faced). His explanation of *ei δ' ἄγε* is particularly ingenious.

An examination of a large number of passages is imposed by the stylistic method and deserves the attention of those interested in Homeric interpretation. Some of the interpretations are more attractive than others; a good specimen is that of *Il.* xiii. 322 (pp. 57-58), whereas the 'comic effect' discovered in *Il.* xxiv. 74 (pp. 118-19) is, to say the least, rather forced. Of great interest is the appeal to internal reminiscences, for example in the handling of *Il.* iv. 160 (pp. 25 ff.). Interpretation by comparison of similar passages is used throughout, and with marked consistency and success in chapter iv, devoted to *ἀλλ' εἰ μοι τι πίθοιο, τό κεν πολύ κέρδιον εἴη*. On p. 76 the line *Od.* xv. 545 is quoted incorrectly.

The modern school of descriptive linguistics will not be satisfied with Tabachovitz's handling of the basic question of hypotaxis and parataxis. His use of the principle that 'der Satz ursprünglicher ist als das Wort' (p. 111; cf. p. 17) takes unfair advantage of the ambiguity of *ursprünglich*. On p. 136 he uses arguments very like those condemned on the previous page. Yet, leaving aside the profounder linguistic issues, his conclusions seem largely justified as far as concerns the epic language, and are welcome as illuminating still further the urbanity of Homer's style and language.

D. M. JONES

Westfield College, London

LOUIS PHILIPPE RANK: *Etymologiseering en verwante Verschijnselen bij Homerus*. Pp. 160. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1951. Paper.

THIS is a doctoral dissertation submitted to

Utrecht University, and it is therefore understandable that it is written in Dutch; the only concession to non-Dutch readers is the sub-title 'Etymologizing and Related Phenomena in Homer'. At the same time, the absence of a summary in English, French, or German is regrettable, since Dr. Rank's work seems to make a valuable contribution to Homeric studies, and deserves to be widely known.

In his introduction (pp. 9-27) Rank, accepting Allen and Sikes's observation (*Homeric Hymns*, ed. 2, 99) that 'the Greeks had but one principle of derivation, aural similarity of sound', discusses such general questions as the differences between ancient and modern ideas of etymology, the origins of etymology, the relation of the name to the thing named, and the connexion between name and fame. He then goes on to study all the passages in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* which reveal their author's interest in language, under six main heads: I. Assonance in general (pp. 28-34), i.e. repetitions of the same root (e.g. *κειμήλια κείται*) or of similar sounds (e.g. *νήσας . . . νῆας*); II. Assonance with proper names (55-73), in which fifty-one names are considered in alphabetical order from *Ἀηδών* to *Χίμαιρα* (by far the most space, 51-63, is devoted to *Ὀδυσσεύς*); III. Homer as a philologist (74-100), dealing with cases where Homer uses doublets, definitions, or paraphrases to explain difficult words or names; IV. Etymology and myth (101-8), which discusses especially *λαοί-λήθιοι* and the gates of Sleep; V. Double nomenclature (109-29) deals with all the recorded cases of people and things which have two names, but gives most space to 'Goden- en Menschentaal'; VI. Poetical invention of descriptive names (130-5) deals with names like Thersites, Ucalegon, and the Phaeacian names in *Od.* viii. 111-15. An appendix (136-43) deals with terminology (e.g. *ἐπώνυμος, ἐπικλησις*); a good bibliography, a list of addenda and corrigenda, and three excellent indexes complete the work.

Rank has been very thorough in collecting his material, has read very widely, and has exercised sound judgement; I have noted only a few doubtful points, such as his treatment of *Il.* xx. 127-8 *πέλοισται . . . Ἀἰσα* as an assonance (32), his claim that *Od.* iv. 136-7 *ποῖον . . . πόσιν* gives 'een volledige overeenstemming van klank' (33), and his failure (on p. 130) to remind his readers that the name Thersites occurs in the family-tree of Meleager (cf. Apollod. i. 8. 6).

J. A. DAVISON

University of Leeds

LENNOX JAMES MORISON: *Sophocles, Ajax, The Women of Trachis. A translation in verse*. Pp. 104. Eton: Savile Press, 1951. Cloth, 5s. 6d. net.

In the style of translation we favour, most of us remain faithful to our first loves, that is to say the style that was contemporary when we first took notice of things. If we have been alive some time, we probably find the usual modern convention rather bare, so determined to avoid poetic jargon that it becomes irretrievably pedestrian. Mr. Morison's version of the *Ajax* and *Trachiniae* is neither contemporary in spirit nor pedestrian. The dialogue is unashamed blank verse, and in the Choruses a limited use is made of rhyme to emphasize strophic correspondence. The second person singular is regularly used and such forms as 'tis' freely admitted. Those who are satisfied with MacNeice or Fitzgerald are unlikely to find this version congenial; those who do not consider poetry and 'the poetic' to be necessarily divorced may appreciate a rendering which has the virtues of purity and clarity. Here are a few lines of Tecmessa's speech as a specimen:

For on the very day thy passing life
Shall leave me solitary, be assured
The Argive lords shall seize me violently,
Me and thy son to live the life of slaves.
And one will jibe at me with scornful words,
'See here the bedfellow of Ajax, once
The mightiest of the host, what servile state
Is hers in change for her prosperity.'

The book is pleasantly produced and remarkably cheap.

D. W. LUCAS

King's College, Cambridge

MARIO UNTERSTEINER: *I Sofisti. Testimonianze e Frammenti*. Fasc. II: Gorgia, Licofrone e Prodicus. Pp. xi+203. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1949. Paper.

THIS second fascicule contains the chapters in Diels-Kranz devoted to Gorgias, Lycophron, and Prodicus. Dr. Untersteiner supplies an Italian translation instead of the German and occasionally adds passages to those selected by Diels. At the foot of the page he gives notes and references of his own which sometimes amount to a running commentary. In the case of Gorgias he also provides an apparatus criticus, and this is particularly full in the long passage from the *de Melisso Xenophane Gorgia* which he adds to

the Diels testimonia. These pages (pp. 56-74) give a full-length study, disproportionate in scale to the rest of the work (which simply seeks to make Diels's *Vorsokratiker* available to Italian students) but nevertheless very welcome. Diels's monograph on the *De M.X.G.* (Berlin, 1900) is the basis of the commentary, but Diels is freely criticized in matters both of text and of interpretation, and Untersteiner often sides with Calogero (*Studi sul Eleatismo*) against him. He does not, however, follow Calogero's more elaborate emendations, as, for instance, in the difficult passage at the beginning of chapter vi (*De M.X.G.* 978 a fin., b init.). But it is not clear that his own proposal *ἡ ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν ἂν εἴη, ἣ καὶ ἔστιν ὁμοιον μὴ ὄν* is more satisfying than Diels's *ἣ ἔστιν ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν ἣ καὶ ἔστιν ὁμοιον μὴ ὄν*. Both are selections from the manuscript readings. Somewhat arbitrarily, but Dr. Untersteiner appeals, not unfairly, to 979 b 14 *ὄντ' ἂν εἴη* (MSS. *ὄντα*) in support of his introduction of *ἂν*, and in general his textual proposals are moderate and confined to real *crucis*.

Untersteiner's commentary in the notes on Prodicus is valuable and compact. He begins the excerpt from the *Memorabilia* a paragraph earlier than Diels, believing ii. 1. 20 to be relevant to Prodicus. In the short chapter on Lycophron one is surprised that he has not repaired the omission in Diels of clear reference to Lycophron's 'social compact' theory in Plato, *Republic* ii. 359 a. But, apart from the special study of Gorgias which gives distinctive quality to this fascicule, the general standard of the work is high and Italian students are fortunate in their *ancilla* to the Sophists. The bibliography is rather general. Dupréel's *Les Sophistes* is not in it.

J. B. SKEMP

University of Durham

GERHARD HUBER: *Platons dialektische Ideenlehre nach dem zweiten Teil des 'Parmenides'*. (Basel Diss.) Pp. 128. Privately printed, 1951. Paper.

IT may well be the case that a correct understanding of the second part of the *Parmenides* would provide the key to the whole of Plato's later metaphysical thought. Unfortunately, despite certain hopeful remarks to the contrary made from time to time, agreement as to its interpretation remains as remote as ever. While few would now regard it as a joke, supporters are not lacking for the view that it is simply an exercise devoid of positive philosophic meaning. Those who find a posi-

tive message' in the dialogue may be divided into two groups. There is first the logical approach typified in this country in very different ways by Cornford (an attempt to clear up ambiguities of terms) and Ryle (an early exercise in the theory of types, operating with certain Great Forms, the μέγιστα γένη of the *Sophist*). In its most positive form this type of interpretation finds as the implicit conclusion of the dialogue a radical modification of the theory of Forms as a whole, even to the extent of an abandonment of the dualism between the world of the Forms and the world of the senses.

The other main type of approach is essentially ontological and sees in the successive Hypotheses of the second part of the dialogue an attempt to establish different layers of reality. It is often associated with the Neoplatonic interpretation of the dialogue. It is here that Dr. Huber's dissertation is to be placed. He argues that both in the *Parmenides* and throughout the dialogues all the Forms have two aspects—they can be viewed as qualities, as the 'Was' or Determinans, and as entities which are qualified, as the 'Dass' or Determinandum. The Form as Determinatum is a union of Determinans and Determinandum. In the light of this doctrine the Hypotheses, and above all the first two Hypotheses, are regarded not as involving a *reductio ad absurdum*, but as both true. The first Hypothesis is concerned with the Form as Determinans, and the second with the Form as Determinatum. Thus the relation between the paired Hypotheses is not one of contradiction but is essentially dialectic according as the process of thought moves from one aspect to the other of the Form as Determinatum. The later Hypotheses are treated as expressing the results of further determinations of the Forms and as exhibiting similar dialectic relationships.

Such an interpretation is not without attractions. It makes the second part of the dialogue provide an answer to the questions about the Forms raised in the first part. In comparison with some other modern Neoplatonic interpretations it has the merit of starting not from the Hypotheses of Plotinus but from the text of the *Parmenides*. While the Determinans is regarded as identified in the first Hypothesis with the Form of the Good which is beyond Being, this aspect is not stressed and the main emphasis is on the dialectic relationship of the Forms to one another. The ontological approach seems to go back at least to the first century A.D., and is in no sense inherently unlikely. None the less the difficulties in supposing that Plato himself intended the dialogue to be under-

stood in this way are considerable and have frequently been stated. It is a weakness of the present dissertation that it fails to consider these difficulties and objections. Plato ends the dialogue with what seems a definite statement that all the Hypotheses form a single argument leading to contradictory conclusions (166 c 2-5). This Huber calls a 'deliberately enigmatic abbreviation' because it omits reference to the positive results. At the conclusion of the first Hypothesis (142 a 7-8), Aristoteles says οὐκ οὐκ εἶποναι δοκεῖ. Of this Huber says, p. 28, that the negation is subjective and to that extent contains within itself an affirmative. But in fact it seems clear that the first Hypothesis was intended by Plato as a *reductio ad absurdum* and this is confirmed by the words quoted. There is every reason to suppose that the second Hypothesis was intended to be understood in exactly the same negative fashion as the first.

G. B. KERFERD

University of Manchester

MARGARET E. REESOR: *The Political Theory of the Old and Middle Stoa*. Pp. x+60. New York: J. J. Augustin, 1951. Paper.

THIS doctoral dissertation from Bryn Mawr College is divided into three main sections, the first concerned with the political theory of the Old Stoa, the second with Panaetius, Hecaton, and Blossius, and the third with Posidonius. The discussion of the views of the Old Stoa is largely a recapitulation of the political fragments; perhaps more use might have been made of anti-Stoic writings, and in the discussion of Plutarch on Alexander the Great one misses references to Tarn's fuller discussion in vol. ii of his *Alexander the Great*, supplementing what was said in his British Academy Lecture. As named political fragments are scanty for the Middle Stoa, the rest of the work is largely concerned with a discussion of the sources underlying the political writings of Cicero and other surviving writers. For Panaetius, it is concluded, we may use Polybius vi as well as Cicero, *De Officiis*, and for Posidonius, Cicero, *De Legibus* i, *De Republica* i, *De Officiis* iii. 21-32, *De Finibus* iii. 62-68, *De Inventione* i. 2; Plutarch, *Marcellus* 20; Diodorus xxxii-xxxvii; Quintilian xii. 1. 34-45; Seneca *Ep.* 90. There is surely something of the 'myth of Posidonius' here, and our confidence is not increased when we find that the result is two separate theories about the establishment

and organization of society, both of which would come from Posidonius. None the less the discussion is well worth while, and if not Posidonius, much of the above list is certainly Stoic in tone. In the account of what emerges as the political doctrines of the Stoics there is no attempt to force a system on to the material collected, and the result is a competent and useful survey, none the worse for the absence of startling novelties.

G. B. KERFERD

University of Manchester

KAISER MARC AUREL: *Wege zu sich selbst*. Griechisch und deutsch. Eingeleitet und neu übertragen von WILLY THEILER. Pp. 347. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1951. Cloth.

THIS is a small but convenient and scholarly edition of the *Meditations*. The Greek text incorporates a modest number of Theiler's own emendations, some of them backed by convincing parallels: 5. 26. 1 συγκρίνείσθω (for συγκρινέσθω), 10. 38. 1 ὁδοιπορία (for ῥητορία), 11. 21. 3 ὁμόνοια (for ὁμοία), and 12. 17. 2 καλόν (for πᾶν) are fair samples. The translation, which faces the text, is of the more literal variety, designed merely to aid in understanding the Greek. In view of the number of earlier translations and editions (notably Farquharson's) Theiler has not written a full commentary, but supplies brief notes which are distinguished by the number of helpful references not only to Stoic sources but the literature of later antiquity in general. The introduction is also brief; dealing with the life and opinions of Marcus it seems to dwell regretfully on those contemporary movements of thought—Gnostic, Hermetic, neo-Pythagorean—of which Marcus shows such complete ignorance.

J. TATE

University of Sheffield

JACQUES SCHWARTZ: *Lucien de Samosate, Philopseudes et De Morte Peregrini*. Avec Introduction et Commentaire. Pp. 115. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1951. Paper.

OF these two satirical pieces the *Philopseudes* is undoubtedly the more attractive; it is a delightful little dialogue which shows a light touch and pleasant wit. The *Death of Peregrinus* is crude by comparison; the satire is ponderous and the invective repetitive and

inconsistent. Both, however, provide an interesting commentary on the intellectual movements of Lucian's day. This edition should be of value to more advanced scholars as well as to the undergraduates for whom it is primarily intended.

The Greek text has been prepared on the assumption that the *Γ* group of manuscripts should be followed as far as possible. There is no apparatus, but critical points are discussed in the Commentary where some original emendations are proposed. There are few serious misprints, but the Greek lettering tends to be faint and a number of accents and breathings are omitted or are barely discernible. Attention is drawn to these in a list of errata.

There is an excellent commentary on the subject-matter with abundant information on religious cults, philosophical schools, magic, local history, art, etc. This is more than a compendium of relevant information; it shows considerable learning and independent judgement. The numerous literary quotations and allusions are traced to their sources, and analogous passages elsewhere in the works of Lucian cited. For more detailed information on particular points there is frequent reference to specialized works. Points of language and interpretation are scarcely discussed at all; in view of the type of reader for which this edition is intended, attention might at least have been drawn to the more striking characteristics of post-classical Greek.

The brief note on Lucian himself is mainly concerned with establishing the date of these two works; they are both assigned to the years A.D. 169–70. There are longer introductions to the two works discussing their content and certain questions which they raise.

H. LL. HUDSON-WILLIAMS

King's College, Newcastle upon Tyne

CARL THEANDER: *Plutarch und die Geschichte*. Pp. 86. Lund: Gleerup, 1951. Paper.

THEANDER'S object in this short but concise study is to reinstate Plutarch as a trustworthy authority for historical facts. He discusses first Plutarch's use of first-hand evidence in the *Lives* ('Autopsie und mündliche Tradition'), and draws attention to the care with which he took in details, e.g. of statues. Plutarch travelled widely and read widely but was neither a typical tourist nor a bookworm. In this section Theander makes interesting comparisons between Plutarch's

methods of describing what he had seen or heard with those of other travellers—Herodotus and Pausanias. With regard to the local history of Boeotia Plutarch was well informed, and his topography in particular is trustworthy. The second section ('Plutarch als Biograph') contains a discussion of Plutarch's principles of writing biography, with special reference to what he himself says in *De Herodoti Malignitate*. The third ('Plutarchs Verhältnis zu älteren Historikern in den griechischen Biographien') examines quotations in the Lives from earlier historians. Theander's conclusion here (that Plutarch, except where he makes an explicit denial, has personally read the author whom he quotes) is well founded. The fourth section discusses the sources for the Roman biographies; the fifth ('Plutarch und die griechischen Primärquellen') deals sketchily with inscriptions mentioned by Plutarch. An Excursus collects Plutarch's references to the major Greek poets.

Theander handles his subject well, but it deserves a fuller and more detailed study. The main defect of this work is that its method is almost wholly *a priori*; it shows how Plutarch worked and we are left to judge for ourselves whether he will therefore have been a trustworthy recorder of facts. Theander does not test Plutarch's veracity by reference to archaeological or epigraphical discoveries, or even by full comparisons with other historians. This is worth doing. Sulla's dedication of trophies to Mars, for example (*Sulla* 19), is verified by the discovery of an altar at Sicyon, with the inscription *L. Cornelius L. f. Sulla imper(ator) Martei*; and the name *Ἐπαφρόδιτος* (ib. 34), which Theander mentions (p. 29), is applied to Sulla in *I.G.* vii. 264, etc.

P. 42, note 3: Theander speaks of a quotation from Plato in *De Animæ Procreatione* in *Timæo* xvi. There is no xvi. The quotation occurs in xxix, and Theander has mistakenly given it twice. P. 49: Theander thinks that Plutarch (*An seni sit gerenda res publica*, 1) is misquoting Thuc. ii. 43, but he is actually quoting ii. 44. 4 correctly. The expression 'ein... glaubwürdiger Geschichtsschreiber' (p. 61) is an inaccurate rendering of Plutarch's ἀνὴρ... γραμμάτων οὐκ ἄπειρος ἱστορικῶν. The number of misprints in German, in Greek, and in the numerals of references is high for a book of this size.

A. J. GOSSAGE

King's College, London

geschichtliche und semologische Untersuchung. Pp. 204. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1951. Paper, 600 mk.

THIS volume is the first part of a larger work. It deals with the use of ῥῆμα in the Greek Old Testament, and the last sentence (on p. 187) looks forward to a continuation of the inquiry in the New Testament, making use of the results obtained in the study of the Old.

The starting-point is the fact that in post-classical Greek ῥῆμα tends to drop out of use except as the grammatical term 'verb'. This disuse of ῥῆμα and its replacement by other words, notably λόγος, can be followed in the Septuagint. There are two main differences: the process is slower in the LXX; and it is not carried so far as in secular Greek. The figures for the whole LXX (excluding the Apocrypha) are, λόγος 1,010: ῥῆμα 526; but the range of variation for individual books is very great, e.g. in Genesis λ. 3: ῥ. 49; in Ezekiel λ. 78: ῥ. 3. The author's examination of the figures goes to show that on the whole ῥῆμα is used most frequently in the books which were translated early, notably the Pentateuch; and that the later the translation, the more likely it is that ῥῆμα will be discarded in favour of λόγος. Yet ῥῆμα is not ousted; and the greater part of Mr. Repo's study is devoted to a search for the factors which enabled the word to maintain itself in Biblical Greek when it was out of fashion elsewhere.

This inquiry involves a study of the basic meaning of the Greek roots and of the corresponding Hebrew roots. From this it emerges that ῥῆμα came nearer than λόγος to the underlying sense of the Hebrew terms. The relative frequency of ῥῆμα, especially in the earlier stages of the Greek version, is thus an example of translation-Greek. Later the liturgical use of the Greek Pentateuch made ῥῆμα familiar in Jewish circles and encouraged its use in subsequent translations of other Biblical books. Jewish patriotism probably played a part, as well as communal tradition and the influence of scholarly Jewish exposition of the original text. It is also possible that the similarity of sound between ῥῆμα and the Hebrew root 'MR (cf. Aramaic *mēmrā*) may have helped.

In the course of the discussion a great many individual passages are examined, often in an illuminating way. The work has been carefully and intelligently done and the results have their importance for Biblical theology.

T. W. MANSON

University of Manchester

EERO REPO: *Der Begriff 'Rhēma' im Biblisch-Griechischen. Eine traditions-*

ALBIN VAN DEN DAELE: *Indices Pseudo-Dionysiani*. (Université de Louvain, Recueil de Travaux d'Histoire et de Philologie, 3^e série, 3^e fasc.) Pp. 154. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1941. Paper.

THIS work consists of an *index verborum*, an *index nominum*, and an *index locorum*. The references are to the volumes in Migne; we are still without a good modern edition of the works of Pseudo-Dionysius.

It is now generally agreed that these works were written at the end of the fifth century A.D., but this late date did not prevent their imposing themselves on later ages as the work of Dionysius the Areopagite and having a great influence on the thought of the Middle Ages, both in the East and in the West, where they were current in Latin translations. The Renaissance scholars detected the forgery, but the texts remain important for the influence that they exercised.

To the general vocabulary the compiler has provided a useful guide and that seems to have been his main purpose. He has not been interested, as far as I can make out, in the 'grammatical' words, such as the prepositions and conjunctions. Some he covers with *passim*, others have a few references followed by *et alibi*. There are two groups of people who will regret this, philologists and textual critics. The philologists will notice that the writer did not use ἀμφί and used both ἀνεν and χωρίς, but will not be able to tell from the index whether he preferred one of these two to the other; under both they will find the phrase *et alibi*. The textual critic will lack guidance over these words, and this is a pity as the adequate critical edition of the text has still to be constructed.

Despite these limitations, the compiler has produced a very useful work which all students of Pseudo-Dionysius will find valuable.

G. D. KILPATRICK

Queen's College, Oxford

K. BÜCHNER, J. B. HOFMANN: *Lateinische Literatur und Sprache in der Forschung seit 1937*. Pp. 299. Bern: Franke, 1951. Paper, 23.80 Sw. fr.

PROFESSOR BÜCHNER's report on Latin Literature will be found extremely useful by all who work in this field. After H. Fuchs's masterly survey of the development of Latin studies

(*Mus. Helv.* iv, 1946, pp. 147-98), to which Büchner professes himself strongly indebted, there was still room for a more detailed account, enabling the reader to decide which are the books or papers he needs for his own work, and which he can safely dispense with. The report is somewhat selective, and anybody who cares may quarrel with the selection. Among Latin authors not mentioned at all are, the elder Pliny, Quintilian, Statius, and Martial. There is a brief reference to Tertullian, but no word of Axelsson's important *Prioritätsfrage* (1941), or the editions of the *Apologeticus* (Hoppe), *de Pallio* (Gerlo), *de Anima* (Waszink). The modern author most frequently quoted (according to the index) is Büchner, with his teacher Klingner a close second. But on the whole there can be no doubt that Büchner has succeeded in giving a stimulating discussion of the essential work done in the period. That is a great achievement, and our gratitude for it is not diminished by the fact that a bias for *Wesensschau*, often enough of the rather laboured variety, tends to upset the balance of the report. Klotz on the sources of Livy is just mentioned, Paola Zancan on the 'Geschichts- und Staatsdenker Livius' (*Tito Livio*, Milan, 1940) has well over half a page. Nor will Professor Büchner's philosophical reflections, which take up more space than the title would seem to justify, make us less grateful for the true wisdom and excellent judgement often shown in his comments (e.g. on the comedy of Menander, p. 18).

The matter is in the main arranged in chronological order. After a brief chapter on the pre-literary period there follow sections on republican (pp. 11-90), Augustan (pp. 91-147), post-Augustan (pp. 148-71) literature and on the later Empire (pp. 172-84). 'Römische Lebensbegriffe' (pp. 185-98), 'Römertum im allgemeinen' (pp. 199-215), 'Methodisches' (pp. 216-22), 'Bibliographien und Hilfsmittel' (pp. 223-35), and 'Zusammenfassung' (pp. 236-40) round off the work.

Enormous labour has obviously gone into the report, which, so far from being a mere compilation, pursues every problem with great energy and gives valuable directions to further research. In view of this it may be ungracious to censure minor imperfections. It seems to me, however, that in setting forth his own views the author has gone beyond the limits set to a report: an interpretation of Hor. *Od.* ii. 7 occupies no less than six pages. The style here is peculiarly turgid, and elsewhere there are passages which severely tax the understanding even of the German reader. Some misprints might have been re-

moved, e.g. at the end of the first paragraph, p. 7, read 'ihr' for 'sein', 'Beginn' for 'Ende', 'dem' for 'der', and 'Ende' for 'Beginn'. Inaccuracies are rare: on p. 15 the contents of a paper by F. W. Hall are wrongly described, and Hall and W. B. Sedgwick represent 'amerikanische Forschung'.

The linguistic part of the Report (there is, significantly, no heading to it; in the Index the two parts are referred to as 'Teil Büchner' and 'Teil Hofmann') is, to put it mildly, a disappointment. No blame attaches to the author. But the editor and the publishers ought not to have misled us by the title of the work. This, in the main, is not a report on the Latin Language but on 'Altitalische Sprachdenkmäler', and not for 1937-50 but for 1931-7, reprinted from *Bursians Jahresberichte*, cclxx (1940), 3-122. An introductory section of less than three pages informs us of this fact and mentions a few major works that have appeared in the meantime. A 'General Part' of little more than two pages on 'Umgangssprache', 'Vulgärlatein', 'Uromanisch', and 'Sondersprachen' is new. The 'Special Part' (pp. 248-82), covering (i) Handbücher, (ii) Vorgeschichte der Italiker, (iii) Illyrian, Venetian, Etruscan, Raetic, Ligurian, Sicul, (iv) Oscan, Umbrian, Faliscan, contains in all about three pages of up-to-date matter, added in bits here and there (Whatmough's *Foundations of Roman Italy*, 1937, is still 'inaccessible'). Hofmann's report on 'Altitalisch' in Bursian was a masterpiece; and since that report is not readily available its partial reprint here will be welcome to comparative philologists, though the principle which has guided the selection is not easily discerned. It must, however, be firmly stated that the purchaser who expects to find a discussion of recent work on the Latin language has wasted his money.

O. SKUTSCH

University College, London

W. A. LAIDLAW: *Latin Literature*. Pp. 229. London: Methuen, 1951. Cloth, 5s. net.

PROFESSOR LAIDLAW's book, in the series 'Home Study Books', differs from most other works of the kind in that it is arranged not chronologically but by literary genres. Thus a chapter on 'Didactic Poetry' deals with Lucretius, Virgil's *Georgics*, Grattius, Manilius, the *Aetna*, Columella x, Nemesianus, Avienus, and certain of Ausonius' poems. Another, entitled 'Biography and Memoirs, Letters and Dialogues', treats of Nepos,

Suetonius, the *Historia Augusta*, and the Panegyrici, together with the letters of Cicero, Seneca, Pliny, Fronto, and Symmachus, Seneca's dialogues, and Aulus Gellius.

Now it is true that the boundaries between different literary forms were sharply drawn in the ancient world, and that a writer of epic poetry or drama or history was far more conscious then than he would be today of the patterns established by his predecessors. Some genres, of course, are more homogeneous than others; thus the chapters on epic, pastoral, or history have a unity lacking in those on 'Epigram, Fable and Occasional Verse' or 'Didactic and Technical Prose'. Yet the experiment as a whole does not seem successful.

In the first place, it is difficult within Laidlaw's framework to find room for comparison of the work of the same writer in different genres. Indeed the men who created the literature sometimes dissolve into a series of cross-references. Virgil, for instance, turns up first in chapter 3 as the author of the *Aeneid*, again in chapter 5 as the poet of the *Georgics*, and finally in chapter 7 as a writer of pastoral poetry. Cicero is divided between chapter 4—where he makes two separate appearances, as orator and as philosopher—and chapter 13. The man and his work scarcely emerge in the round, and his central position in the history of Roman civilization is neither described nor explained. One who knew Latin literature only from Laidlaw's book would be at a loss to understand St. Jerome's dream (Jerome *Ep.* 22. 30).

Secondly, the sense of 'period' is lost when the whole course of Latin literature has to be rapidly surveyed for each separate kind of writing. This is a serious matter, because it encourages the reader to detach 'literary history' from 'history', and literature from life.

Thirdly, connexions are blurred by the order of treatment. An example is that between epic poetry and history. On p. 40, where Ennius is introduced as the Roman Homer, the point is not made that the *Annals* is an historical epic, and that certain important consequences follow therefrom. And in chapter 12 the effect on almost all Roman historiography of the pattern set by Ennius' *Annals* is not brought out.

To those, however, who know the background and can supply the missing connexions the book is well worth reading: it is full of shrewd and sympathetic judgement succinctly expressed.

The author's name is warranty enough for the general accuracy of the work. But here

and there Professor Laidlaw seems to have nodded: e.g. p. 63, *esse videatur* is not really Cicero's favourite clausula (cf. A. W. de Groot, *De numero oratorio Latino commentatio*, p. 8); p. 121, Callimachus was not second director of the Alexandrian library, and probably never director at all; p. 126, l. 3 from the foot, for 'Menelaus' read 'Agamemnon'; p. 200, to describe Pliny as 'financial officer of the emperor in Bithynia' is misleading.

ROBERT BROWNING

University College, London

DOMENICO BRAGA: *Catullo e i poeti greci*. Pp. 274. Messina: D'Anna, 1951. Paper, L.1200.

THIS is no severe statistical study of borrowings and reminiscences. Professor Braga deals in successive chapters with the influence on Catullus of the epic, the iambographers, Sappho, the tragedians, Callimachus, Apollonius, and the epigrammatists; but his treatment is discursive and some of what he says has little to do with Catullus' relation to his predecessors. He makes some good observations—on the lessons which Catullus learned from Callimachus and how he differed from him, on Catullus' technique in translation, on the originality of the *Attis*. But many topics are pursued at inordinate length (four pages and a half is a generous allowance for the relation between Catullus and Pindar), and one tires both of the rhapsodies of praise and of the superficiality of judgement which finds evidence of a 'concordanza di spiriti' between Catullus and Euripides in Cat. 17. 22 and *Bacchae* 506. Poem 46 is compared with some epigrams which hail the coming of the spring and the zephyrs—and indeed there are certain verbal similarities which may be more than accidental, though Catullus perhaps was capable of writing *iam . . . iam . . . iam* whether or not he knew of the ἴαμ . . . ἴαμ . . . ἴαμ of Thyillus. But this is followed by three pages of discussion, in the course of which Catullus' state of mind is likened first to that of his own *Attis* and then to that of Horace, like whom he sought refuge from his troubles by retiring to his *fundus seu Sabinus seu Tiburs*, and we are finally told that Catullus shares with Virgil and Horace 'l'anima della terra, intesa o nel senso ristretto di un angolo caro o in tutta l'estensione del termine'. With similar extravagance Braga finds in the closing lines of poem 31 'la religiosità dell' inno' (there is not much 'religiosità' about *venusta* or *cachinni*) and in poem 62 a 'certamen poetico

tra Saffo e Catullo' in which the 'grazia delicata del lirismo eolico' is set against the 'sano realismo della lirica italica'. On poem 4 he notes an 'analogia di costrutto' between *ait fuisse* and φησιν . . . ἀγχείσθαι [sic] of *A.P.* vi. 149 (not 143, as he says); the reader who supplies the omitted words will wonder what the analogy is.

C. J. FORDYCE

University of Glasgow

R. E. LATHAM: *Lucretius, The Nature of the Universe. Translated with an introduction*. Pp. 256. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1951. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.

THIS translation 'by abandoning all attempt to reproduce the grammatical structure of the Latin' seeks to 'express the poet's meaning and something of his spirit without any wide departure from normal English usage', since the reader unversed in Latin idiom (for whom the work is primarily intended, in spite of an unusually generous discussion in the Introduction of Lucretian latinity) finds the scholarly translators' renderings 'strangely contorted and at times barely intelligible'. Whatever the truth of this—and one might retort with Latham's own 'juice of Bacchus', 'Centaurs and Mermaids', or even 'final escape from this conclusion is precluded by the limitless possibility of running away from it' (i. 983)—the version is in general not difficult reading, so far as the original permits. Rarely, and usually on minor points, does it fail to convey accurately the Latin meaning: as, for example, i. 70 'quickened his manhood', 345 'embedded as they would have been in motionless matter', 424, 'on obscure questions', ii. 1080 'animals', iii. 156 'the eyes swim', v. 476–7 'revolve actual bodies'. In the more subtle task of conveying to the non-classical reader the 'spirit' of Lucretius—who was 'a disciple first and a poet second', though 'by temperament he was more poet than philosopher' (Int., pp. 12–13)—the work is less successful. Comparison between the prosaic rendering of the Invocation and many phrases elsewhere suggests increasing desire to reproduce the poetic quality. There are, however, not infrequent faults of style beyond justification even in the 'middle but somewhat zigzag course' that Latham claims to have steered: i. 109 'hocus-pocus and intimidations', iii. 150 'jumps for joy', 539 the *anima* 'leaks out in dribbles—in other words, it perishes' (cf. 589), iv. 274 'a double dose of air', v. 567 'breathe a warm blast', and the incongruity of certain

favourite words, 'bounce', 'spray', 'shove' (the wind 'shoves along the mighty mass of a mighty ship'). But despite such blemishes let it be said that the translator is no pauper in his native tongue, and that there is much of real quality in the version. With cool revision it might be very good indeed.

G. CLEMENT WHITTICK
King's College, Newcastle upon Tyne

Livy. With an English translation by A. C. SCHLESINGER. Vol. XIII: Books xliii-xlv. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. vii+425; 6 maps, London: Heinemann, 1951. Cloth, 15s. net.

This is a useful volume for those who are interested in Livy's account of the critical years 171-167 B.C. Schlesinger has provided a readable text, fitted out with an ample apparatus criticus; his translation is accompanied by helpful notes. The maps are relevant and clearly drawn.

On the text, which owes much to Giarratano, there is little to say. The sole manuscript (*Vindobonensis*) has received full attention in the past, and Schlesinger exercises good judgement in his choice of corrections and supplements. He departs only rarely from generally accepted, or at least well-represented, conjectures, and then not always happily. For example at xliii. 5. 8, where he reads *duobus fratribus regulis*, Madvig's *fratri reguli* is surely preferable; at 12. 3 one must add Madvig's *decreverunt*; at 14. 2, despite the note, it is hard to justify *et* before *iuniores*; at 16. 8, in view of the mistakes and omissions in the manuscript, one need not try to defend *ad eius rogationem*, and it is better to delete *eius* or add *legis* after *eius*. In the other books Schlesinger is more cautious. Only at xlv. 4. 1 'decem pondo auri et argenti ad summam sestertii deciens' he wishes to emend *decem*, on the ground that 'the weight of metal is obviously too small for the value given'; but *argenti* is usually, and reasonably, taken with the following phrase, not with *pondo*. He has better grounds for doubting *octo* at xliii. 9. 5.

At xliii. 5. 10 there is a case for reading *Cn.* (not *C.*) *Sicinius*. At xlv. 19. 4 the Latin Festival was to be held *pridie idus Apriles*, but according to 22. 16 it was actually held *pridie kal. Apriles*, a fortnight earlier. Schlesinger notes that there is probably a confusion in the text, and certainly one would not have expected the date to be advanced; also, judging from the business which Aemilius Paulus had to transact before he left for

Greece, immediately after the Latin Festival, the beginning of April was too early. One may therefore read *idus* in 22. 16—unless the mistake is Livy's. On xlv. 18. 6, where Schlesinger reads *concilium*, see Larsen, *C.P.* xlv (1949), pp. 73 ff. for *consilium*.

The English rendering is accurate. Following the order of the Latin, the sentences do not run easily; but the translation as a whole aids the reading of the text, and the phrases are well turned.

In his notes Schlesinger watches the course of events and comments on features of Livy's account e.g. on xlv. 13. 12, 20. 7, 25. 3, xlv. 22. 6 for annalistic tendentiousness; on xlv. 5. 4, 11. 5 for practical details of military engineering; on xlv. 14. 13 about the Rhodians. A few criticisms are possible. The Romans by this time were scarcely shy of operations by sea (as suggested at xliii. 1. 9, xlv. 6. 6). The annalistic passage at xliii. 6. 8-9 is unreliable and cannot be pressed. If Livy's criticism of Marcus Philippus at xlv. 4. 9 shows 'weakness as a military commentator', he errs in good company (cf. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani*, iv. 1, pp. 302-3). The reference to Nissen at xlv. 10. 12 for words indicating Livy's use of Polybius is a poor one: Nissen has much better examples (*Krit. Untersuchungen*, pp. 74-75). At xlv. 35. 14 the *ala* is not cavalry but the detachment of *socii*; at xlv. 16. 3 the cavalry could be Roman. To the appendix on chronology (pp. 87-88), based on Unger, and the note on the dating of Pydna (at xlv. 37. 5), add the treatment by De Sanctis, op. cit. iv. 1, pp. 369 ff., and note the inscription confirming the date (Meritt, *Hesperia*, iii, 1934, pp. 18-21; v, 1936, pp. 429-30).

A. H. McDONALD

Clare College, Cambridge

ENRIQUE FRANÇOIS: M. T. Ciceronis *Cato Maior de Senectute Liber*. Pp. xi + 215; 15 ill., map. Buenos Aires: Instituto de Filología Clásica, 1951. Paper.

It is difficult to do justice in a small edition to the vast range of questions connected with the *Cato Maior*. But one is entitled to expect more than mere biographical and historical information, however copious. The reader who approaches François's edition hoping to find discussion of Cicero's idealization of Cato Maior and of the relevance of it to the political thought of Cicero's day and in particular to men's views of Cato Uticensis, or comment on Cicero's style and vocabulary,

or information on philosophical thought in the late Republic, will seek in vain.

The preface tells us that the sole aim of the notes is 'a facilitar su inteligencia como obra de elevado pensamiento y de significativo valor histórico'. But references to Stoic doctrine (e.g. in sections 4 and 5) receive no attention, the allusions to Cato's interest in tombstones (12, 21, 61) are not connected with his writing of the *Origines*, words like *emancipata* (38), *sodalitates* (45), *magisteria* (46), and the technical terms of chapter 15 are left unexplained, and there are no comments on the several difficult passages where Havet (*Journ. Sav.* 1902, pp. 370-82, 401-12) proposed a transposition and Willeumier (*Rev. Phil.* 1931, pp. 104-15) in reply has attempted to explain the traditional text.

François's historical comment leaves much to be desired. There is no discussion of the different traditions concerning the dates of Africanus' death and Cato's quaestorship (Nepos, *Cato* 1. 3 and Plut. *Cato* 3. 5 are quoted (p. 30) alongside Cicero *Cato Maior* 10 and *Brutus* 60 as if they gave the same account), and the story of Cato's service with Fabius at Tarentum (*C.M.* 10) and his conversation with Nearchus (*C.M.* 41) are accepted without comment. The traditional view of the career and status of Livius Andronicus is given (p. 163) without mentioning Professor Beare's criticism of that view (*C.Q.* 1940, pp. 11-19). Neither Münzer's 'Atticus als Geschichtschreiber' (*Hermes*, 1905, pp. 50-100) nor R. E. Smith's 'The *Cato Censorius* of Plutarch' (*C.Q.* 1940, pp. 105-12) is referred to; and one would gladly have exchanged a badly reproduced and unintelligible map of Numantia or a photograph of the sarcophagus of a Carthaginian priest for a discussion of Cicero's historical sources and his indebtedness to Atticus' *liber annalis*, which is not even mentioned.

J. H. SIMON

University of St. Andrews

J. LABOURT: Saint Jérôme, *Lettres*. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé.) Tome 2. Pp. 213 (192 double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1951. Paper.

THE second volume of the Budé edition of Jerome's Letters, comprising letters 23 to 52, has the merits and the faults of its predecessor (reviewed in *C.R.* lxiv, 1950, pp. 58-59). The text is substantially that of Hilberg (Vienna, 1910): Labourt's only emendation

seems to be *dum tute* in 29. 1; his other differences from Hilberg are in minor variants of the manuscript tradition.

The translation is clear and careful on the whole. But there are more slips than one likes to see. For example: 43. 2 'quos si secunda hora legentes invenerit' is not 'si seulement la deuxième heure [explained in a footnote as 'vers dix heures du soir'] nous trouve en train de lire', but 'if we read for more than an hour on end'; 45. 4 'nunc in sacco et cinere' etc., the translation does not correspond to the text printed, but to a conjecture suggested in the 'note complémentaire' on p. 198, in which, incidentally, Labourt wrongly claims to be translating Hilberg's text.

The critical apparatus, which purports to select the more important variants from Hilberg's immense apparatus, is most misleading, as the following examples selected from *epp.* 29 and 30 will show: P. 26, l. 10 'igitur b, om. cet.': this note refers to line 1, and Labourt has wrongly copied Hilberg's lineation. P. 28, l. 5 'Hebraea AITD': this really refers to line 15, where the text has *Hebraica*, and not to line 5, where *Hebraeo* is the reading of all manuscripts, accepted by all editors. P. 30 l. 18 'add. mater communis ei valeat gaudeo et ut valeat dominum deprecor B': the reading of B is actually 'm. c. si • valet' etc. P. 31 l. 22 'ex MDM, θ (s. r.), B (in ras. m2), om. N': the first M should be Π. P. 32 l. 19 'et om. GMN || a om. IIDMθB': the first note refers to the *et* in line 16, the second to the *a* in line 21. P. 33 l. 23 'et haec] (h)eth ista (om. γ) IIDMθγ, B': what Labourt apparently believes to be a variant for *et haec* is in fact a garbled version of an addition which these manuscripts have *before* these words. P. 34 l. 9 'disciplinae sive cordis': the reference is to *disciplinae* in line 7, not to *disciplina* in line 8 (there is no possible lemma in line 9).

It will be a pity if scholars are misled by the deservedly high reputation of the Budé series into turning to Labourt for information on the text of Jerome's letters. It would have been better not to print a critical apparatus at all, and to give us only a good text and a fair translation, at which none could cavil.

ROBERT BROWNING

University College, London

LUCILE KELLING and ALBERT SUSKIN: *Index Verborum Iuvenalis*. Pp. vii+139. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press (London: Ox-

ford University Press), 1951. Cloth, 40s. net.

A MODERN index to Juvenal is a useful tool, and this one, based on the texts of Owen, Housman, Jahn-Bücheler-Leo, and Vianello, has been very carefully done. I have noticed only a few slips: an adjective *Gallius* has been assumed at 9. 30; the *paretur* which in some manuscripts ends 3. 224 is assigned to *pareo*; P's *plerumque* in 8. 72 is detached from the *plerumque* of 11. 46, and (presumably because it is a variant for *plenumque*) put under *plenus*; *triviale* is wrongly made nominative at 7. 55, *sociis* ablative at 8. 108. The modesty of the authors' preface disarms criticism, but one or two questions may perhaps be asked.

(1) What is the use of swelling the list by including the misspellings or ghost-words which happen to appear in the apparatus of the selected texts but which are certainly not what Juvenal wrote? No one is likely to think of looking up *grambe*, *fulchrum*, *occansio*, *circophiteci*, or *improbidus* in an index, not to speak of *encultu*, *nontibi*, or *ca*, or the various aliases (ranging from *Aufega* to *Lanfella*) of Saufeia: if one did, one would not be profited, since the apparatus do not profess to record such things exhaustively. (2) Is it not a pity to distinguish words of the same spelling only by the numbers attached to them in Harper's dictionary? Unlike some more pretentious indexers, the authors make no mistakes over these words, and that is the main thing: but it would have saved the consulter at least a moment's thought if pairs like *lêvis-lêvis*, *cêdo-cêdo*, *incido-incido* had been distinguished by what seems the obvious means. (3) What is wrong with *Iuvenalianus*? (4) Is 'indentation' (p. 2) American for 'indentation'?

The authors mention that they have done the whole work without even clerical assistance. They deserve the more to be thanked for their altruistic industry and congratulated on their accuracy.

C. J. FORDYCE

University of Glasgow

RENÉ MARACHE: *La critique littéraire de langue latine et le développement du goût archaïsant au II^e siècle de notre ère*. Pp. 359. Rennes: Plihon, 1952. Paper, 1200 fr.

THE central theme of Professor Marache's book is the literary theory and criticism of the archaizing school in the second century, as propounded by Fronto and developed and

modified by Aulus Gellius. He also considers the subsequent influence of their principles in Apuleius, whose *Apologia* he believes to be posterior to the *Noctes Atticae*, and in later authors. An important part of his discussion is, however, devoted to the history of archaistic groups or individuals, and their practices, from the Ciceronian age onwards. Distinguishing firmly between the taste for antique simplicity and the pursuit of archaism as a literary device, he does not see in any of these influences the origins of Fronto's archaistic renascence. He acknowledges that they prepared the ground, pointing out, for example, that Valerius Probus provided future archaizers with the example of his method and with scientifically established texts (p. 77). Rejecting Norden's 'dualism' (pp. 10-11) in favour of Wilamowitz's opinion, he denies any continuity between Latin atticism and Frontonian archaism, rightly stressing the difference between the characters and histories of western and eastern atticism. The affinity which is admitted is that between Fronto's aims and attitude and those of contemporary Greek atticists such as Herodes. Not that Fronto's theory is a Greek import; it is the Latin response to a corresponding situation, in dealing with which a Latin writer was at an obvious disadvantage compared with Greek contemporaries. An attempt to describe the artistic atmosphere of the civilization into which these men were born is made in a chapter entitled 'La révolution artistique au temps d'Hadrien'. There is much to be said for Marache's contention that, this situation having been produced in Italy by the rhetors of the first century, they are the real precursors of Fronto and his school. 'Tout se subordonne au plaisir de l'auditeur' (p. 71), and 'il s'agit de donner à l'auditeur une opinion avantageuse de la personne qui parle' (p. 128). Speakers and audiences with these objects in view, with an ever-decreasing concern for subject-matter, turn in the end from excess of modernity to a new and contrary excess, for which lovers of ancient simplicity had unwittingly prepared the way. This view accords with the failure of the Frontonian innovation to reinvigorate a declining oratory and with the superficiality, pedantry, and incoherence of Gellian criticism.

The large sections of the work devoted to Fronto and Aulus Gellius are of great value and interest. The author draws distinctions between the interests and doctrines of the two writers, which, when due allowance has been made for the different scope and purpose of their writings, remain valid. The eclectic attitude of Aulus Gellius, and his

classicism, which Fronto's teaching did not succeed in submerging, are convincingly illustrated. His nostalgia for the ancient world is shown to involve much more than 'la recherche du mot rare'; he is obsessed with the imagined moral perfection of antiquity. What the author calls his 'humanism' is with much probability argued to have been inspired by Favorinus' teaching and example. The author's congenial sympathy with the writers commented upon does not preclude objective criticism and severe judgements, particularly in the case of Aulus Gellius, whose personality and convictions especially invite consideration and discussion. Marache has a sympathetic appreciation of what these critics accomplished, but he is fully conscious of the limits to their possible achievement. He is aware of their intellectual pusillanimity, and recognizes in the waverings and inconsistencies of Aulus Gellius the behaviour of a man who serves too many masters.

A defect that renders the work somewhat tedious is that of repetition. In successive chapters the authors are approached from different angles, and the same statements and illustrations recur in different contexts. This defect of readability, redeemed, it should be said, by much liveliness and propriety of expression, is accentuated by an eccentricity of punctuation so consistent as to appear intentional. There are some serious misprints, both in the text and in Greek and Latin quotations.

The index and the bibliography are good.

W. S. MAGUINNESS

King's College, London

THEODORUS BERNARDUS BONIFACIUS SIEMERS: *Seneca's Hercules Furens en Euripides' Heracles* [With summary in English.] Pp. 111. Heerlen, Holland: Limburgsch Dagblad, 1951. Paper.

This work is a thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor in Letters at the University of Utrecht, and, as Dutch theses usually are, it is a thorough and painstaking study of the subject proposed. Siemers compares Seneca's play with its progenitor, Euripides' *Hercules Furens*, taking it character by character, and adding a short discussion on the roles of the chorus.

He estimates the literary value of Seneca, not against the standard set by Greek Tragedy, but against the social environment of the playwright's own time and its particular needs. He thus does not set Seneca up

as a neo-Euripides, but as an author in his own right, whose influence upon later European theatre was by no means negligible.

Seneca's characters, he concludes, are a more homely or everyday version of those of Euripides, the heroic element being scaled down. But linked to this scaling-down there is a somewhat Dickensian tendency to make the characters ultra-good or ultra-bad—principally the latter. It follows therefore that they lose, to a very great extent, their Greek character, as is most noticeable in the portrayal of Hercules himself.

Siemers quotes rather little Greek in his text—it is not easy to see why—and carefully translates all the Latin passages. I presume, from considering the bent of his bibliography, that the reason is to make his work more accessible to students of the history of the French, Italian, English, and Dutch theatre.

One notes with some surprise that he relies for information on the Greek Theatre on no work published later than 1897, and chiefly on one dated 1789. But perhaps it is no great matter; we can safely include this publication in the relevant literature on Seneca's theatrical works.

W. R. SMYTH

University College of Swansea

ARTHUR PATCH MCKINLAY: *Aratoris Subdiaconi De Actibus Apostolorum*. (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, Vol. LXXII.) Pp. lxiv+363. Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1951. Paper, S. 150.

MCKINLAY is the first editor of Arator to have based his text on a close examination of the numerous manuscripts available. These include several of good quality, and by their utilization he has produced a text much superior to those of previous editors. Many disfigurements have been removed and interesting readings introduced. Instances of readings with which the reviewer disagrees occur at i. 826, where the correction *tuae* for *tua* is essential; ii. 371 and 468, the well-authenticated *lectio difficilior* is rejected; ii. *Argum.* 569, *inuenturi* should be *in uenturi* (Mras); ii. 960, the clearly corrupt *uelles* (most manuscripts) is retained; ii. 1236, *titulos* is deficient in both authority and sense. The punctuation is sometimes faulty, e.g. i. 57, 393, ii. 305, 366 f., 377 ff., 537 f., 1013 ff. For conjectural emendation the soundness of the tradition leaves little room and McKinlay is rightly conservative: the two conjectures

adopted, at i. 827 and ii, *Argum.* 623, have no justification. The text is accompanied by a list of sources, another of glosses (often helpful), and a concise apparatus criticus. In his introduction McKinlay gives a summary of the manuscripts, various *testimonia*, including imitations of Arator several of which in fact reflect earlier writers, and a bibliography.

The least satisfactory part of the work is that involving interpretation, grammar, and word-usage; and confidence in the editor is shaken by such specimens of latinity as 'ordo rerum tractarum' (p. vi), 'neuter cum masculino' (p. 211), 'index scriptorum una cum eis ab editore passim citatis' (p. 224). The critical notes are amateurish and embody several errors (e.g. the scansion *Florîane* where pentameter demands *Flôrîâne*, *cupis* noted as a shortening, ii. 103 *quod* taken as causal conjunction, ii. 1012 *rupis* taken as genitive instead of rare nom.). The *index grammaticus*, which includes word-usage, is slovenly (e.g. such rubrics as 'polus: pro alte', 'subdens esse pro subdit'), sketchy (omitting such interesting usages as i. 215 *licet* with noun subject, ii. 375 *inde queri*), and contains many errors (e.g. 'conuenior pro uerbo impersonali' ii. 141, 'cupere in cum accusatio' i. 597, 'fusae pro nata' i. 173). Some of the other indexes include irrelevant matter (e.g. 'Baptismatis figurae' and 'Oxymora', a term which McKinlay seems to equate with *antithesis*). Useful is the (apparently complete) *index uerborum*. There are many misprints, including spelling errors in the text at i, *Argum.* 624, 732, 786, ii. 115, 358, 895, 981; on p. ix a whole line is repeated and another is missing.

A. HUDSON-WILLIAMS

University College of Wales,
Aberystwyth

O. NEUGEBAUER: *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity*. Pp. ix+191. 14 plates. Copenhagen: Munksgaard (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Cloth, 42s. net.

By the exact sciences Neugebauer means mathematics and astronomy. His purpose is to survey the relationship between mathematics and astronomy in ancient civilizations. In particular he wishes to discover the effects on Hellenistic science of developments in Babylonia and Egypt. He has written a very readable and a very important book. His name is familiar for his researches, so that it is with reluctance that he turns aside from them to address a wider public. But in so

doing he has rendered a signal service to scholarship, and his masterly book explains its somewhat inaccessible subject to the layman with greater clarity than any other study known to me.

In form the book consists of six chapters, originally lectures, on Numbers; Babylonian Mathematics; The Sources, their Decipherment and Evaluation; Egyptian Mathematics and Astronomy; Babylonian Astronomy; Origin and Transmission of Hellenistic Science. The treatment of each subject is selective rather than comprehensive. What is said is designed mainly to explain the origin of Hellenistic science. But each chapter is completed by a bibliography and by notes and references, which are not less interesting than the text itself. Finally the fourteen plates are more than a pictorial supplement: they are an integral part of the exposition.

In his chapter on the sources Neugebauer sets forth the limitations of the Babylonian material available. There are perhaps 500,000 tablets in various museums and these no doubt represent but a small fraction of what may yet be uncovered by the spade. But that is not the most serious obstacle to research. This consists in the fact that at the present rate of decipherment—so few are the competent workers in the field—it would take many centuries to publish the material. The recovery of a knowledge of Babylonian science rests on the work of a handful of men. Father Strassmaier towards the end of last century spent many years copying tablets in the British Museum. With the help of Father Epping of Quito, it was realized that they contained arithmetical progressions skilfully utilized for the prediction of lunar phenomena with an accuracy of within a few minutes. In a little paper of ten pages in a Roman Catholic theological magazine was laid in 1881 the foundation of this new and most important branch of science. But Budge in his *Rise and Progress of Assyriology* (1925) records that Strassmaier thought it a waste of time to try to compile an Assyrian dictionary while so many thousands of tablets in the British Museum and elsewhere remained unpublished. "Today", writes Neugebauer, 'one may repeat this statement, only replacing "tens of thousands" by "hundreds of thousands".'

What emerges from the scanty material as yet interpreted may be suggested in a few sentences. Already before 1500 B.C. Babylonian arithmetical procedures had been fully developed. These procedures formed the basis of Babylonian mathematical astronomy, which, however, is not attested by the existing material before the time of the Seleucids. Contrary

to the general opinion, Babylonian astronomy is mainly mathematical rather than observational. The results and procedures of Babylonian astronomy were available to the Greeks from the time of Hipparchus and form part of the heritage of Ptolemy. The Egyptian contribution to this heritage was slight, the chief element in it being the adoption by the Hellenistic astronomers of the Egyptian calendar of 12 months of 30 days each with 5 additional days at the end of each year. This Neugebauer calls 'the only intelligent calendar which ever existed in human history'. Again, contrary to general opinion, what is called Chaldaean astrology was a Hellenistic creation. Neugebauer quotes with approval the judgement of Cumont: 'Hipparque, dont le nom doit être placé en tête des astrologues comme des astronomes grecs'. Astrology, however, was not the only original creation of Greek students of the heavens. Babylonian mathematical astronomy rested on arithmetical procedures. Geometrical astronomy was the achievement of the Greeks. 'By and large, one has to distinguish two widely separate types of "Greek" mathematics. One is represented by the strictly logical approach of Euclid, Archimedes, Apollonius, etc.; the other group is only part of general Hellenistic mathematics, the roots of which lie in the Babylonian and Egyptian procedures. The writings of Heron and Diophantus . . . form part of this oriental tradition.'

B. FARRINGTON

University College, Swansea

EUGENIO MANNI: *Demetrio Poliorcete*. Pp. 126. Rome: Signorelli, 1951. Paper, L.1000.

DEMETRIUS POLIORCETES has attracted considerable attention in recent years, and the inscriptions published within the last few years from the American excavations in the Agora and elsewhere suggest that there is still more to be done. In the present study Manni is less concerned to present a character-study of Demetrius himself than to examine the sources for, and chronology of, his career, and he shows a welcome restraint from psychological analysis. The work falls into two quantitatively equal parts, a general narrative (pp. 1-64), and appendixes dealing with chronological and other matters (pp. 67-126), the latter partly based on, and partly amplifying, the author's previous contribution to the study of the chronology of the early Hellenistic age in *Rend. Linc.* 1949 (5), pp. 53 ff. The narrative is straightforward

and reliable, within the traditional framework, and Manni shows himself well abreast of the latest work in the field. There is perhaps less analysis of individual texts than one could wish here, but Manni always indicates where such a critical analysis is to be found. This will not be the final estimate of Demetrius, based even on the material now available, but it is a sensible interim report.

The second, more technical, part of the work opens with an analysis of Diodorus book xviii, the aim of which is to justify Diodorus' chronology (and with it that of the *Marmor Parium*, to which Manni devoted greater space in *Rend. Linc.*). On this matter there can be no certainty until there is further light from inscriptions, since Diodorus omits reference to the archons of 321/20 and 320/19, and the distribution of events is therefore not absolutely certain. Manni's arguments for the distribution he suggests are not without interest, though they are in places expressed rather obscurely. But his attempt to assign the events described in xviii. 64-72 to the Attic year 318/17 and not (as in Diodorus) to 319/18 turns, as he himself sees, on the date of the death of Phocion; and his efforts to get away from the commonly accepted view that *I.G.*² ii. 387, in which the Athenians honour envoys of Polyperchon, is a document of the restored democracy established after the downfall of Phocion, do not seem to me successful; but this is, at all events, a genuine attempt to re-examine the evidence (one might contrast the unfortunate performance of T. Lenschau, who in his article on Phocion in *R.E.*, published in 1941, saw no objection to basing his account of the last days of Phocion's life on an inscription, *I.G.*² ii. 389, which Dinsmoor in 1931 showed beyond doubt belonged to the year 293/2). The other appendixes, dealing mainly with the period after Ipsus, do not add much to our understanding of the problems concerned, since Manni is on the whole content to restate accepted solutions in his own words. In general he relies much on the work of two illustrious scholars, Ferguson and De Sanctis (perhaps inevitably in a field where they have striven so long and so profitably); in matters where they have been at issue with one another he inclines more often to side with the latter. The difficulties and insufficiencies of the evidence are, however, clearly stated, and these appendixes will form, at least for Italian students (for whom they are no doubt primarily intended), a serviceable introduction to highly controversial material. On the whole, then, a useful book.

P. M. FRASER

Brasenose College, Oxford

HEINRICH DRERUP: *Aegyptische Bildnis-köpfe griechische und römische Zeit*. Pp. 28; 16 plates. Münster in Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1950. Paper, DM. 2.50.

THE author takes a series of heads, produced in Egypt during the last three centuries before Christ and the first two after, which show a mixture of traditional Egyptian and intrusive Greek or Roman characteristics. He endeavours to assess the importance of the various elements and the degree to which a successful fusion of them was achieved. He begins with the famous Green Head (*der grüne Kopf*; Berlin 12, 500), which he places in early Ptolemaic times and sees as essentially part of a native tradition in which the sculptor has successfully incorporated a touch of Greek influence. This brilliant promise, however, was not fulfilled, and Drerup traces a decline through the next two centuries, during which the Egyptian sculptors of these heads show themselves open in varying degrees to Greek influence but not really able to digest it. The best head of this period which he illustrates (Munich, Glyptothek 47) stands apart from the rest of the series, being evidently the work of a Greek who has accommodated himself in some degree to an Egyptian pattern. In the first quarter of the first century B.C. the author finds an 'Egyptian Renaissance' in the Harsinebef and its companions, whose sculptors, while abandoning many of the traditional forms of Egyptian heads, revert in spirit to old Egyptian ideals. He points out that the effect is curiously like that of contemporary Roman Republican portraits, and prepares the way for the direct influence of 'Roman-Hellenistic' portraiture, shown in several heads of the mid-century including one masterpiece, the 'Barracco Caesar'. Here, for the first and last time since the Green Head, a true synthesis of Eastern and Western is attained. From here the author briefly traces a second decline through the early Imperial period, and notes, from the end of the first century A.D., an interesting relation between these heads and the painted mummy-portraits. Drerup's analysis and estimate seem convincing, though to distinguish so nicely between Hellenistic and 'Roman-Hellenistic' influence on a foreign art shows more exact knowledge of the Italian contribution to late Hellenistic portraiture than some may think attainable. I am struck by an odd fortuitous likeness in some of these heads to other unconnected arts in whose formation a mixture of East and West has played a part—a touch of

Gandara in the Munich head, and of Late Antique portraiture in the Harsinebef.

MARTIN ROBERTSON
University College, London

Festgabe für Arnold von Salis zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstag am 29 Juli 1951. Pp. 305; 4 plates, 66 text figs. Basel: Schwabe, 1951. Paper, 12 Sw. fr.

THIS birthday volume is a reprint of *Museum Helveticum*, viii, fasc. 2-3. The quality is perhaps rather above the average of such productions. E. Howald shows a narrow ingenuity over the Sarpedon of the *Iliad*, and finds him (and much else) adapted from an earlier epic on Memnon. Ernst Meyer argues persuasively that, in spite of the recent Mycenaean finds near Messenian Pylos, Homer's Pylos is after all Kakovatos in Triphylia; he adds a history of the name Navarino. G. Hafner expatiates on Eros ἀκρ' ἐπ' ἀνθη καβαίνων. R. Hampe cites Euripides, *Cycl.* 185-6 to support the conjecture λιμπανε or the like in Sappho fr. 27a (Diehl), l. 8. C. Weickert observes that Greek gravestones gain much by standing free instead of being set against a wall; he explains this by the 'tectonic' purpose of the stele, which requires also a crowning feature (unlike the dedicatory relief). W. H. Schuchhardt publishes a marble head of a youth from Nyon, which he defines—perhaps too precisely—as a good copy, executed in north Italy in the Julio-Claudian period, of a Greek, perhaps Argive, bronze of the 460's B.C. E. Langlotz reasons ably against C. M. Olmstead that the 'Penelope' statue from Persepolis is not itself the original of the Roman copies, which reflect more faithfully an archetype of c. 460 B.C.; this he identifies unconvincingly, but with interesting details, as the Larisa of Telephanes. K. Schefold offers interpretations of two terracottas said to be from Tarentum. F. Wehrli shows that Plato uses metaphors derived from the doctor's methods quite differently from the Sophists, who laid stress on empirical techniques: at *Laws* 720 the Hippocratic tenet that the good doctor should establish sympathy with his patient is restated to illustrate the paedeutical aspect of the law-giver, and falls far short of Sophistic relativism. Accordingly to Wehrli no development is perceptible in Plato's use of these images: a fuller and more methodical treatment is perhaps needed to establish this point, and also to distinguish where appropriate between Hippocratic and Sophistic views on the doctor's task. R. Exner, republishing a statuette of Heracles and the

Hydra that was till its destruction in Würzburg, makes the good suggestion that the Ludovisi 'Medusa' is part of a similar composition.

A. Alföldi convincingly interprets the youthful obverse-heads on denarii of Q. Cassius, M. Platorius Cestianus, and Faustus Sulla as types of Romulus, and sees in these and in the Jupiter Terminus reverse-types (alluding to the *ampliatio pomerii*) on denarii of M. Pupius Piso Frugi Calpurnianus and Augustus, part of the 'Golden Age' propaganda of the first century B.C., in which the late-Republican leaders (notably Pompey) and the first Princeps were represented as 'new Romuli', that is as 'new founders' and enlargers of the *imperium*. L. Curtius discovers an unusually plump and idealized portrait of Trajan in an amethyst-intaglio in Paris, which he thinks may have served as the mould for glass medallions of the type already known from the Julio-Claudian series of portrait-*phalerae*. But a glass-technologist has informed the reviewers that the heat required for fusing the glass-paste would almost certainly have cracked the stone had it had been so employed. R. Herbig describes a painting from the Casa di Ercole at Pompeii in which the freeing of Heracles by Omphale is depicted under the guise of a Roman *mancipatio*. W. Deonna traces an early Imperial Gallo-Roman bronze statuette found at Uriage (Isère) back to a Hellenistic adaptation, to an Apollo Citharoedus, of the Apollo Sauroctonus of Praxiteles and the Pothus of Scopas. H. Schoppa detects the same hand at work in the stele of Ajacius in the Rhineland and in two togate figures in high relief at Bordeaux; and he pleads for more intensive research on the sculptural material in the French museums.

P. Collart examines E. Weigand's theory of far-reaching Roman influences, artistic, architectural, and religious, at Baalbek in the light of new evidence. The excavations of 1930-5 have revealed that the central, dominating feature of the great temple-court was a monumental altar (as yet unpublished), completely native in character and largely decorated with relief-sculptures in a purely local style. This discovery confirms D. Schlumberger's conclusion, drawn from a study of the Corinthian capitals of oriental type on the site, that a vigorous school of native craftsmen was working at Baalbek, during the first two centuries of our era, side by side with those who introduced Western artistic styles (themselves ultimately derived, as Collart might have noted, not from Italy, but from Asia Minor and mainland Greece) into the city in the wake of the

Roman colonists. Western influences at Baalbek were, in fact, much more restricted in scope than Weigand supposed. M. Stettler traces the transition from Roman to Christian architecture in circular buildings. He shows how the spatial unity of the Pantheon, with cupola resting securely on the massive walls of the drum, was but slightly modified in Santa Costanza by the insertion of an inner ring of columns; whereas in the Baptistry at Nocera Superiore and in Santa Sophia the old classical delimitation and solidarity have been abandoned, and a sense of mystery and infinity achieved, largely by new lighting effects from windows pierced in the dome. S. Guyer returns to the problem of the 'demise of ancient civilization' (*Untergang der Antike*) from the angle of architecture. He finds the phrase to be applicable, on the whole, to the West, but untrue of the East in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, when Byzantium, Asia Minor, Syria, Armenia, and Egypt each evolved, from the classical heritage, a new and remarkably independent Christian style—a process rudely interrupted in lands submerged by the Islamic invasion. Guyer laments the uniformity of culture imposed by Imperial Rome. Yet it was surely Rome's tolerance of native ideas and craftsmen in eastern lands which made these local developments practicable.

Finally, W. Andreas writes on Goethe's Roman letters to Carl August, H. Mobius on Peter Wagner's painting of Hyacinthus and Polyboea, and F. Staehelin on Burckhardt and Dilthey.

R. M. COOK

J. M. C. TOYNBEE

Cambridge

GISELA M. A. RICHTER: *Three Critical Periods in Greek Sculpture*. Pp. xi+86; 142 figs. on 41 half-tone plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. Cloth, 25s. net.

THE three lectures printed here were composed for an audience interested in art, but not particularly in Greek and Greco-Roman art. They succeed unusually well in combining general intelligibility and original research.

The first chapter or lecture reviews the establishment of the ideal Classical style. Miss Richter argues that in the transitional years 480-445 B.C. the dominant trend was towards realism—that is, momentary poses, facial expression of emotions, individualized portraiture—but that this trend was reversed

by Phidias, who though at first a realist matured into an idealist. The argument is forced; in the transitional generation it is realism, not idealism, that is exceptional. In free-standing sculpture momentary poses are rare, though on reliefs—as at Bassae—they remain common after Phidias. Emotional expression is more frequent, but still simple. Portraiture may not have existed at all—at least, neither of Miss Richter's examples is convincing. The Aristogiton of the group of the Tyrannicides has a beard, but otherwise looks to me no more a portrait than the ideal Harmodius; and it is not likely that one partner should be individualized and the other not. On the new bust of Themistocles from Ostia opinions vary. Some think it is an eclectic archaizing work of the Hellenistic period and others a more or less faithful copy of a Classical original; but to date that original as Miss Richter does about 460 B.C. raises historical difficulties, while a date after the Peace of Callias would upset her general theory. The personal development of Phidias is also uncertain. Miss Richter, taking her examples from the Parthenon, traces a progression from violence to restraint in the reliefs of the shield of the cult statue, the metopes, the frieze, and the pediments; but the shape of the field and the nature of the subject offer another explanation. Phidias was a great master and set a standard to his successors, but there is no strong reason to believe that he was opposed to the spirit of his times; and his great contemporary Polyclitus seems to have been a thoroughgoing idealist.

In the first part of the second chapter Lysippus is made the originator of Hellenistic sculpture—his 'innovations correspond to the chief characteristics of Hellenistic art in so far as they differ from those of the preceding, classical art'. But the evidence which Miss Richter produces is weak and indecisive and her use of it rather Procrustean. (Incidentally it is misleading to use 'dry' in translating Pliny's *corpora graciliora siccioraque*.) The subsequent denial of local schools in Hellenistic sculpture is much more cogent: the conclusion is not new (see e.g. A. W. Lawrence, *Later Greek Sculpture*, 2), but she has argued it in fuller detail.

The third chapter, on Greco-Roman sculpture, is important. From the first century B.C., Miss Richter observes, Roman demand determined the production of sculpture. So earlier masterpieces were busily copied (by the new system of pointing) or were closely adapted; lifelike portraiture flourished; historical reliefs developed. But these classes of sculpture are intimately con-

nected and the signatures are with rare and ambiguous exceptions Greek. What is called Roman sculpture is in fact the Greek artistic and technical tradition adapted by Greek sculptors to suit Roman requirements. Miss Richter states her evidence well and her conclusion cannot be reasonably rejected. I am less sure about her corollary, that any original creation (other than a portrait or historical relief) must be of earlier date, though her caution about signatures is fully justified—for instance the Naples herm of Polyclitus' Doryphorus is signed by Apollonius; why then should the Agasias who signed the Borghese Warrior not be a copyist too? But some of her consequent redatings are very attractive, notably that of the Laocoon as a second-century product of the Pergamene style. This attribution is defended in detail in an Appendix, which shows also how rash it is to identify from casual evidence the bearers of common names.

The text is clear and easy to read, and the plates (though not all of high quality) illustrate it adequately with examples both familiar and little known. This is a book which should be useful not only to specialists but also to scholars with a general interest in ancient art. The publishers have done well to offer it at so moderate a price.

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,
Cambridge*

ÅKE ÅKERSTRÖM: *Architektonische Terrakottaplatten in Stockholm*. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen, 4°, I.) Pp. 105; 11 plates (4 coloured), 52 figs. Lund: Gleerup, 1951. Paper, Kr. 60.

THIS is the first number of the twin series of quarto and octavo volumes projected by the new Swedish School at Athens. It publishes the scanty fragments of a set of late archaic terracotta revetments from Larisa in Aeolis, which unaccountably were omitted from the comprehensive study of *Larisa am Hermos* II. The date of these fragments is near the end of the sixth century and the subject, as might be expected, a chariot race. Their main interest is in their apparent imitation of Attic r.f. technique: not only is the background painted black, but the facing layer of clay is of an Attic red.

Åkerström gives 19 pages to a careful description, which includes some good technical observations (esp. pp. 21–23), and 55 pages to his *kunstgeschichtliche Erörterung*, half of it

an account of the motive of the racing chariot in Oriental and early Greek art (incidentally the subject of p. 43 No. 3 is Achilles with Hector's body). Finally there is an excursus on some Clazomenian sarcophagi of the Albertinum group and their dependence on Attic. These discussions are detailed and generally sound, but rather superficial, as is perhaps inevitable at this stage in East Greek studies.

The plates are excellent. The text is easy to read and prodigally illustrated by the numerous figures, mostly taken from other and easily accessible publications. The price is exorbitant for what the volume contains in necessary text and illustrations.

R. M. Cook

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,
Cambridge*

CHRISTOPH CLAIRMONT: *Das Paris-urteil in der antiken Kunst*. Pp. 143; 40 plates. Privately printed, 1951. Paper. To be obtained from the author, Genfer Strasse 30, Zürich.

THE Judgement of Paris is a subject with various pictorial opportunities. Dr. Clairmont has listed nearly 300 representations in ancient art from the mid-seventh century B.C. to the third century A.D. He has shown industry in collecting and acuteness in identifying them. Some of his interpretations may not be accepted—for instance he thinks that the old man who sometimes accompanies the party is Teucer and not Priam (pp. 18–19)—but his arguments deserve consideration. Finally he gives statistics of the components. Clairmont is an honest scholar and does not pretend to see useful general conclusions. The book is well printed on good paper; the plates, from photographs of b.f. and r.f. pots many of which were unpublished, are excellent.

R. M. Cook

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,
Cambridge*

H. H. SCULLARD: *A History of the Roman World, 753–146 B.C.* Second edition. Pp. xiv+470; 4 maps. London: Methuen, 1951. Cloth, 32s. 6d. net.

OF the Methuen Greek and Roman Histories it was once fashionable to wonder whether their compass was not too confined for the

scholar and too ample for the elementary student or the layman. Dr. Scullard's volume has perhaps more than any other removed these doubts in the seventeen years since the first edition appeared, and its second edition reveals even more of the reasons for the book's appeal. Its readability, balance, and sanity were always obvious: what is even more apparent to one who has compared the two editions is the extent to which every sentence has been precisely measured in the light of the latest scholarship. The documentation, now enhanced by a concordance table of ancient authorities for the principal subjects, is economical but also subtle and illuminating; and the result is a work both of practical reference value for the advanced student and of introductory use for one lacking much previous knowledge of Roman history.

For his new edition Scullard has been given a fairly free hand and has used it to rewrite a large number of sentences and paragraphs as well as to call attention in footnotes to new literature, especially on archaeological matters. The main subjects where substantial revision has taken place are the prehistory of Italy, the origins of the Roman tribes and centuries, the Caerite franchise, the *ius Arimini* and kindred topics related to Roman colonization, early coinage, various topographical points, and certain personal and political questions on which readers of his *Roman Politics* may regret but admire his forbearance here. There is also a firmer statement, based largely on the work of A. H. McDonald and F. W. Walbank, of the origins of the Second Macedonian War, though the final paragraph which states that Rome's policy here was an instance of 'muddling through' is now surely out of place: for the premiss of the Holleaux school is surely that the danger which led the Senate to drag a reluctant People into action was conceived with precision and determination.

It is always hard in a work of this kind to determine how the history of religious and artistic ideas shall be fitted into the continuous narrative. It may well be that some of the central chapters would have gained in power if they had been preceded by at least part of the material which Scullard has collected in his Part IV, entitled 'Roman Life and Culture'. But any criticism here must take account of the fact that these chapters have stood the test of time better than any in the book. One correction, however, might pass unnoticed but is perhaps as far-reaching as any the author has made: speaking of the early annalists he now says 'some of these works were later translated into Latin',

whereas in the first edition the possibility is confined to Fabius Pictor.

A small but much needed map of central Italy has been added, and the number of words is greater, though the page is more compressed, than in the first edition. It is perhaps worth recalling, without undue bitterness, that the first edition cost 15s.

G. E. F. CHILVER

Queen's College, Oxford

WALTHER JOHN: *Die Örtlichkeit der Varusschlacht bei Tacitus*. Pp. 30. Göttingen: Musterschmidt Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1950. Paper, DM. 1.50.

To have written this fresh and stimulating paper on such a well-worn theme as the topography of the Rout of Varus is no small achievement. Scholars have mainly concerned themselves with the conflicting accounts of Florus and Dio, and have, says Dr. John, neglected to a surprising degree the one source which gives any topographical indications, the passage in the *Annals* (i. 60-63) describing Germanicus' visit to the scene of the disaster. Tacitus makes the most of the occasion for his own purposes, but if, as is likely, his facts came from Pliny, there is no need to disbelieve them because they are presented dramatically.

Tacitus describes how Germanicus saw a camp for three legions, the half-destroyed entrenchments raised by the remnant of the army, and the whitening bones *medio campi*. Dr. John believes that these were all at one and the same place. The *prima Vari castra*, lying in a swampy district, could not be the regular summer camp, but must be a marching camp, set up after the first alarm. From this Varus set out, lulled by the pretended friendship of Arminius, and was soon afterwards attacked, suffering heavy loss. He managed to struggle back to the camp, in a corner of which his reduced force threw up the weak rampart seen by Germanicus. *Medio campi* means in the middle of the camp, where, on this theory, the last fight must have raged.

So what must be sought is a regular three-legion marching camp in a locality once surrounded by woodland and marsh and approached by some ancient prehistoric route which Germanicus could have followed from the middle Ems into the territory between Ems and Lippe. There is just a chance, Dr. John thinks, that if it has not been built over,

it may yet be found. One wonders whether, despite long-established cultivation, it might be picked out from the air, or whether, indeed, it may not already have been inadvertently photographed during war-time air reconnaissance.

OLWEN BROGAN

Cambridge

LUDWIG BUDDE: *Jugendbildnisse des Caracalla und Geta*. Pp. 54; 26 plates Münster (Westf.): Aschendorff, 1951. Paper, DM. 4.

THE purpose of this essay is to investigate *de novo* an interesting problem of Roman iconography, that of the youthful portraits of the sons of Septimius Severus, Caracalla, and Geta. Starting with the undisputed representations of both princes on coins, on the Paris and New York cameos, and on the Severan Arch at Lepcis Magna, and of Caracalla alone on the Berlin painted medallion and on the Porta Argentariorum in Rome, the author shows that we have sound criteria for distinguishing between their respective features and hair-styles; and with these as guides he succeeds in sorting out and distributing between the brothers the most important examples of a series of childish and youthful marble heads and busts, clearly dating from the turn of the second and third centuries, although some were once wrongly described as Antonine.

The decades 190-210, within which the portraits under discussion fall, witnessed a definite change of artistic emphasis. In the youthful portraits of Caracalla the ultra-baroque taste which informs his father's iconography gives way before a revival of more restrained and 'classical' Hellenistic standards; while the portraits of the younger brother anticipate the non-plastic, abstract, geometric treatment of the human hair and features in vogue among artists between c. 220 and c. 260. But Budde tends to go too far, perhaps, in reading into this stylistic distinction a conscious attempt to express the deep-rooted antagonism which governed the brothers' relations. As regards the two attractive child-studies of the princes from Chiragan (now at Toulouse), almost certainly the work of the same hand, we must not forget that nature may have had something to do with the technical discrepancies. It may well be that the sculptor used the drill in rendering Caracalla's hair, and refrained from using it in rendering that of Geta, because the former's hair was really crisp, coarse, and curly, the

latter's really sleek, fine, and silky. Again, if Geta as a youth of fifteen and upwards favoured the new 'skull-cap' coiffure, this might have been due to a simple penchant for the latest fashion—a fashion occasionally followed by Caracalla himself as Emperor, since Budde is surely right in refusing, in the light of the Geta portraits, to assume that the New York Caracalla statue must be posthumous.

Budde's identification of the superb head at Kassel as an unofficial portrait of the seven-to-eight-year-old Caracalla is most convincing. But some observers may well feel that he has overstressed its peevish, gloomy, and tragic expression as already heralding the future bloodthirsty tyrant.

Two points should be noted apropos of the Severan Arch at Lepcis. First, it is much more likely that the triumphal scenes refer in a general way to Septimius' major oriental victories, suitably commemorated in his birthplace, than to local successes over recalcitrant Libyan tribesmen (p. 45, note 10). The defenders in the scene of the siege of a city are clearly long-robed oriental bowmen. Secondly, it is not true that the meaning of the scene described on p. 13 is uncertain. It shows Septimius before a temple presenting Caracalla as his heir to the three-city Tychari of Tripolis, who are accompanied on the left by a now headless togate figure, probably not Geta, but the Genius Senatus of Lepcis, and by Virtus, who is, incidentally, not portrayed as a statue standing on a basis, as is the case with the branch-bearing god (by no means certainly Silvanus) at the opposite end of the picture.

The author has performed a very useful service. The book is pleasantly printed; and the illustrations are extremely well chosen and clear.

J. M. C. TOYNBEE

Newnham College, Cambridge

NAPHTALI LEWIS and MEYER REINOLD: *Roman Civilisation*. Selected Readings. Volume I: The Republic. Pp. ix+544. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Cloth, 32s. 6d. net.

THIS collection of sources in translation is intended to serve the same function as Botsford and Sihler's *Hellenic Civilisation*. It is the first volume of a two-volume work. Volume I covers the Roman Republic; the second

volume will cover the Empire to the fourth century; 27 B.C. is taken as the dividing date. Volume I now under consideration gives first an Introduction on Sources, Roman Historiography, Republican, Imperial, and Christian Writers, Legal Sources, Inscriptions, Papyri and Similar Documents, Coins. In all cases Greek as well as Latin sources are dealt with, in a brief fashion. There follows the selection of passages from all the above categories (except coin legends), sometimes with brief introduction to subdivisions and always with brief explanations in footnotes, and divided under heads of a fairly obvious sort: Beginnings to 509 B.C.; Conquest and Organization of Italy to 264 B.C.; Domestic Affairs to 264 B.C.; Overseas Conquests 264-27 B.C.; The Roman Revolution; The Administration of the Imperial Republic (abroad and at home); Society and Culture 264-27 B.C. (including all manner of sources on Religion, Life, and Manners).

The editors (in their preface) provide their own comment: 'We recognize that every condensation involves a process of interpretation, and that it would be impossible to find agreement among scholars on what is indispensable in such a compilation of selections', and outline their procedure: 'to present the material in topical chapters arranged chronologically; and in the selection of texts to exclude snippets, however classic, to avoid duplication of materials from different periods, and to limit markedly technical or rhetorical pieces and purely narrative passages—such as descriptions of the endless wars and battles of Roman history—to a very few examples, in order to give more space and greater emphasis to texts illustrating the political, administrative, religious, economic, social, and cultural aspects of Roman civilisation'. It is assumed that the student 'will either be acquainted with the main lines of Roman history and literature or have ready access to general histories on these subjects as well as to an atlas of classical geography'.

The translations are drawn to a great extent from those of the Loeb Classical Library, or are adapted from such; so they will vary in quality a great deal, as will the text from which they are made. Other translations, some very well known, have also been employed or adapted. Where no suitable translation was available, as in the case of many of the inscriptions, the editors have produced one of their own.

The selection of material seems to be an admirable and up-to-date one. It is followed by a Glossary and a Bibliography (containing only works in the English language) which

suggest doubts tempering the reviewer's initial approval of the general purpose of the book. One cannot but sympathize with a desire to take the student from the general history book back to the sources. There is plenty of room for the use of translations. But this work nevertheless does not avoid falling between two stools. It is true that in this country as in the United States Roman history is to some degree studied by those who have no knowledge or little knowledge of Latin, and no knowledge of Greek. It is also true that relatively detailed studies may be attempted by those who have little or no Greek, but such students must have a fair knowledge of Latin, and will hardly need a great many of the translations in this book. Possibly conditions are different in the United States, but an odd picture is given by selections of Livy in a translation adapted from Bohn's Classical Library side by side with documents such as those relating to Seleucus of Rhosus, a bibliography which excludes all work in foreign languages, and a glossary misleading in its brevity and elementary in the extreme. What scheme of teaching and what sort of student all this implies the present reviewer cannot imagine. A shorter work giving a selection of the sources more difficult to come by, and of the Greek and Latin inscriptions, might be of value, but no such work can ignore the necessity for a knowledge at least of Latin. It is hard to see, also, how the bibliographies 'prepared primarily with a view to assisting the English-speaking student and general reader who may wish to probe further into the subject matter of the several chapters' will get anyone very far without some knowledge of Latin and Greek. The book is excellently printed and produced.

R. J. HOPPER

University of Sheffield

(1) BENOÎT LACROIX: *L'Histoire dans L'Antiquité*. Pp. 252. Montreal: Institut d'Études Médiévales, 1951. Paper.

(2) W. C. McDERMOTT and W. E. CALDWELL: *Readings in the History of the Ancient World*. Pp. xxii+489. New York: Rinehart & Co., 1951. Cloth, \$4.

THESE two books, diverse in quality of execution, are linked by a common origin in the New World, and by a certain common purpose, the promotion of the study of Greek

and Roman Antiquity by those in no great measure familiar with the classical languages.

The first, Canadian in origin, is a collection of passages from Greek and Latin authors (Thucydides, Aristotle, Polybius, Lucian; Cicero, Seneca, Tacitus) selected to show the ancient attitude to historiography. The selection is a useful one: but the texts are reproduced by some mechanical process (a sort of anastatic reprint) from Teubner, Budé, and Loeb editions and are to a considerable extent illegible. This seems to be the fault of printer, not editor. It is a dreadful warning of what may happen when a country does not possess or loses the rare skill of the compositor in the classical languages. The translations are Budé or other standard French ones.

The collection is followed by a curious scissors-and-paste-seeming account of ancient views of historical writing. This is superficial and uncritical in the extreme, quite out of keeping with the important and somewhat technical subject here tackled. Indeed it is not clear why this introduction for beginners has been produced at all as a volume in what seems to be a popular series. The whole work, with paper, printing, and binding, is no credit either to Canadian scholarship or to the Church whose *Impri-matur* it bears.

The second work is in a very different category. The teaching of Ancient History may not attain a high quality without some knowledge, in the student, of Greek and Latin, but even so the non-classical student of history must have some knowledge of Ancient History and its sources. The attempt to satisfy this need has, on the whole, been made with more intelligence and skill in the U.S.A. than in Britain. This book is an admirable instrument to introduce such students to the historical material. It consists of a brief introduction on Greek and Roman historical writers, followed by a long series of selections in translation not only from the literary authorities but also from inscriptions and middle Eastern documents originally in non-classical languages. Many of the translations are well-known ones, works of literature in themselves. Certain sources have been omitted as readily available elsewhere; so Homer, and Plato's *Republic*. Quotations from the Bible might have been omitted on the same ground, but perhaps the compilers wished to stress its importance as a source of historical material. There is a very useful list of source references. The scope is wide, from Sumerian Lagash to Constantine and New Rome. The book is well printed and bound.

It is unfortunate that its price and origin in the 'hard currency' area will prevent its extensive use in Britain.

R. J. HOPPER

University of Sheffield

CARL W. BLEGEN, JOHN L. CASKEY, and MARION RAWSON: *Troy: the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Settlements*. Vol. II. Part 1: Text. Pp. xxii+325. Part 2: Plates. 318 figs. Princeton: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Cloth, 235s. net.

OF this book it is almost enough to say that the thoroughness and excellence of vol. I (see *C.R.* lxvi. 95) are, as one would expect, maintained. The order and method of publication of the third, fourth, and fifth settlements, completing the Early Bronze Age period of Troy, are the same as for Troy I and II. Nine plans and sections and eight charts of types and shapes of pottery, etc., have been repeated from the earlier volume for ease of reference, and an appendix tabulates the occurrences of the different classes of artifacts (including pottery) from Troy I to V. This last is of unquestionable value for reference, though the editors' claim that the tables 'speak for themselves' leads one to expect something more graphic.

Troy III (not the 'Burnt City' of Schliemann, which represents the later stages of II) was laid out with narrow passages running between blocks of houses built with little reference to earlier walls. Stone-and-brick construction is superseded by walls of stone alone, still standing to 2 metres high; but housekeeping showed no advance, and as garbage raised the floor-levels the walls were heightened to make headroom. Bones of *Cervus* show venison was a new and common food, and there are many small objects made of deer-bone or antler; so the Trojans perhaps spent more time hunting than in the home. Foreign intercourse, attested by imported pottery (imitated locally) and a few Cycladic types in copper and marble, was mainly with Greece and the Aegean; but the material allows of no exact dating. It can only be said that Troy III corresponds roughly with the period between E.H. II and E.H. III.

Troy IV was a large settlement, probably walled, certainly more than Dörpfeld's *ärmliches Dorf*. There is a reversion to stone-and-brick construction in the houses; but some

advance is observable in the introduction of built domed ovens, and in the greater variety of shapes and better finish of the pottery. External relations are still westward-looking, and this phase can be equated with a late (but not the latest) stage of E.H. Greece.

In Troy V there are more marked developments and changes in the way of life. Houses are both more orderly in planning and more carefully appointed, with neater and better-built benches, ovens, and hearths; and floors were kept cleaner of rubbish. There was less venison about, but more beef and pork. In pottery the old traditions are still strong, but there is a real refining of technique, both in shapes and in finish. Metal objects are of bronze, not copper, and perhaps for the first time. (Analyses are still awaited for Troy IV.) Although relations with the West continue there are new links with other parts of Anatolia (Larisa in Aeolis, Kusura, Alişar and Alaca, Tarsus) and even Cyprus. The new stirring was perhaps due more to the Trojans' neighbours than to themselves; for the succeeding VIth settlement appears to mark the arrival of a new population, though Troy V goes out without sack or pillage. The writers suggest that it was overwhelmed in the same movement of peoples that brings in the Middle Bronze Age in Greece, a movement contemporary with the first establishment of the Hittites in central and southern Anatolia.

F. H. STUBBINGS

Emmanuel College, Cambridge

J. LAWRENCE ANGEL: *Troy. Supplementary Monograph 1: The Human Remains*. Pp. 40; 14 collotype plates. Princeton: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Cloth, 48s. net.

EVERY drop of information is here extracted from the material available, and presented with that scientific thoroughness which characterizes this series. But with only eleven 'usable' post-classical skulls and skeletons, and only nine for the preceding 2,500 years—to which are added eight from earlier excavations—Angel frankly admits the limitations of possible inferences. The book is for anthropologists; and when it is suggested that the Trojan skulls are 'linked basically with the east, with connections of progressively less importance from southeast, south and west (Aegean), northwest (Balkans) and north', we who are not anthropologists will

do well to note that the author only calls this an hypothesis, and not abuse it.

F. H. STUBBINGS

Emmanuel College, Cambridge

H. HOMER: *Attila der Hunnenkönig von seinen Zeitgenossen dargestellt*. Pp. ix + 238; 3 plates, 2 maps. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1951. Cloth, DM. 7.50.

A BOOK containing a translation of all the major contemporary documents relating to Attila and the Huns would be of service to many, not least to students of medieval Germanic literature, some of whom are unfamiliar with Greek. An attempt has been made to fill this gap by Homeyer, who is already known in this country for his *Pocket German Dictionary*, edited in collaboration with Dr. M. L. Barker. The translations, where the reviewer has tested them, are accurate on the whole, though the German seems scarcely to be inspired.

Between the translations Homeyer has woven a narrative of the career of the Huns in Europe, and this narrative contains an extraordinary number of mistakes and slips. Thus, in the first fifty pages we read that a large-scale Hunnic attack was launched across the Danube in 375/6 following on smaller raids (p. 7, cf. 22), the Tanais is the Caspian Sea (p. 12), Constantine settled the Visigoths north of the Danube in 332 (p. 24), Prosper Tiro lived in the first half of the fourth century (p. 27), Theodosius II was the Emperor in whose presence the Prefect Rufinus was murdered (p. 28), Hunnic auxiliaries frequently fought for the Romans in the years following 400, Athaulf founded the Visigothic kingdom of Toulouse, Huns fought for the Goths early in the fifth century (all these on p. 31) and for the Romans in 427 and 428 (p. 33), Oetar was called Otkar (*ib. et passim*), the chronicler Marcellinus was contemporary with Attila (p. 39: correct elsewhere), Attila probably lived as a hostage among the Romans after 406 (p. 41), his uncle was called Aebarse (p. 42), the Huns had no religion whatever (p. 45, cf. 179), the Theodosian Code was published in 439 (p. 49) as well as in 438 (p. 50), and so on. Elsewhere we read that Theodosius II died in 451 (p. 52) as well as in 450, while the unfortunate Aetius was stabbed to death in 451 (p. 54), 453 (p. 56), and 454 (Chronological Table at the end of the book). So important a figure as Attila's lieutenant Onegesius is converted into a Greek named Onegesimus (pp. 83, 91 n.). The brief biblio-

graphy contains no reference to Thomas Hodgkin, the maps are useless, and in the Chronological Table there are at least twenty-five mistakes.

E. A. THOMPSON

University of Nottingham

EDWARD ALEXANDER PARSONS: *The Alexandrian Library*. Pp. xiii + 468; 6 plates, 2 figs., 6 maps. London: Cleaver-Hume Press, 1952. Cloth, £2. 10s. net.

ALTHOUGH the evidence for the history of the Alexandrian Library has been fully investigated, the need for a monograph on the subject has often been felt by scholars. The task of writing it requires, in the first place, industry and wide reading, both of which assets Parsons possesses in abundance. But he is handicapped by his ignorance of Greek and Latin, as is apparent from his treatment of Tzetzes' note on the Library. This important piece of evidence survives in its original form in the Prolegomena to Aristophanes, and in a Latin version in a fifteenth-century manuscript of Plautus (which Parsons was instrumental in rediscovering). He has had these two parallel texts translated by different hands, and has made no attempt at consistency in passages where the Latin is a literal translation of the Greek; his 'emended and rearranged' version is really a restatement of the facts, having little direct textual connexion with Tzetzes. For instance, the Greek *συνμικτών . . . ἀπλῶν . . . καὶ ἀμύγων* is translated 'unsorted . . . single, sorted books' and the corresponding Latin *commixtorum . . . simplicium . . . et digestorum* as 'mixed volumes . . . single volumes and digests'. In both (for the Latin is plainly a translation of the Greek) the antithesis is between rolls containing one work and those containing more than one. There are other inaccuracies; e.g. in the Greek (§ 33, Parsons p. 113) 'by Zenodotus' should be added after 'edited', and the translator of the Latin has rendered *reliquorum* as 'other' instead of 'the other' (p. 108). *οἷς ἂν καὶ μέχρι μῖδος λέξεως . . . ἐπέσθην* is translated 'I took their word for, oh, one expression' (p. 113).

Parsons's exposition of the relevant facts is at times lucid, but perpetually tends to degenerate into a variorum compilation. Nor is the privilege of quotation always accorded to the most deserving; Ernst Curtius and Mure are scarcely indispensable authorities on the Pisistratean 'recension'

of Homer, but Parsons quotes them at length, although he makes no mention of T. W. Allen's important article on the subject in *C.Q.* vii. 33 ff. Among other important modern works which Parsons ignores may be mentioned Pfeiffer's *Callimachus*, though he mentions both volumes in his bibliography. But exposition of the relevant facts forms only a part of the book; Parsons criticizes Athenaeus for 'squandering' on 'gossip' 'hundreds of pages which might have been devoted to the Alexandriana' [*sic*], but himself interpolates irrelevant anecdotes and descriptions of Oriental luxury, and devotes pp. 276-86 to a dramatic account of the meeting between Caesar and Cleopatra. We may doubt if many tastes are catholic enough to appreciate such passages equally with the plans of Alexandria which Parsons has included 'for those archaeologically minded' and the statistics of ancient quotations from Homer which he reproduces from Ludwich on pp. 259 f.

Many points of detail could be criticized; e.g. p. 211: in describing the classification of Pindar in the Library Parsons says simply 'a sub-group was created for each place'. Does he think that Pindar (by contrast with Simonides, cf. the following note) wrote only epinicia? Pp. 251 ff.: the list of students of Homer is largely superfluous; the inclusion of Alcibiades, for example, shows that it is not confined to scholars, and a list of all who studied the poems would include every educated Greek. P. 265: that Aristophanes of Byzantium was 'probably not the author of some of the metrical hypotheses' to Aristophanes seems an understatement, and in discussing the same scholar's work on Homer Parsons might have mentioned his view that the *Odyssey* ends at xxiii. 296.

There is interesting material here for future lexicographers, e.g. p. 219, 'examples of possible situations might be pyramided to dizzy heights'; 239, 'an ancient scholia'; and for grammarians, e.g. p. 221, 'to Alexander the Aetolian was assigned the tragic writers'. Proper names are habitually misspelt, and there are numerous misprints. Recognized conventions of punctuation are largely discarded. The style lapses for long periods into a tasteless yellow-press rhetoric which will repel many of those interested in the subject.

D. MERVYN JONES

Exeter College, Oxford

BRUNO SNELL: *Theorie und Praxis im Denken des Abendlandes*. (Rektorats-

rede.) Pp. 34. Hamburg: Conrad Kloss, 1951. Paper, DM. 1.80.

THIS interesting address is clearly intended primarily as a contribution to the debate on the functions of universities which has been going on in Germany since the end of the war. Its theme may be stated as follows. The opposition between theory and practice is essentially a European problem and is unknown to Indian and Chinese philosophy. After Aristotle the opposition became absolute until the Renaissance restored to theory its original significance as the contemplation of the real world. At the present time, in 'arts' subjects, purely theoretic and scientific studies have assembled a vast mass of knowledge and information, and we are faced with the problem of using this knowledge for the best. The solution is the realization that special studies, while valuable in themselves, necessarily imply and lead on to a study of the whole. The *studium generale* which results is not purely theoretic but merges into the search for a basis for living. If they were not so scarce, the ideal occupants of professorial chairs in Germany would be *Universal- und Generalgelehrte*.

The important point here is clearly the acceptance of the need for some change in direction for German university studies. But there is apparently a danger of identifying two rather different problems—that of over-specialization, and that of purely theoretic investigations divorced from the needs of the community. In this country it is perhaps the first which has attracted greater attention, while in Germany both problems have clearly been much discussed. The danger of over-specialization is obvious both in research and teaching. But its correction does not necessarily bring what is taught or studied into closer accord with practical needs; and there are dangers inseparable from general studies which Professor Snell either ignores or does not choose to mention on the present occasion.

G. B. KERFERD

University of Manchester

J. WIGHT DUFF: *A Literary History of Rome from the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age*. Edited by A. M. Duff. Pp. xvi+535. London: Benn, 1953. Cloth, 42s. net.

THIS book, which was published by Fisher Unwin in 1909 (*C.R.* xxiv. 65) and has been out of print for many years, is too well known

to need appraisal here. Students will heartily welcome its reappearance and will be glad to know that the equally valuable companion volume on the Silver Age is likely to be reissued also. In this new edition the original text, including the biographical matter in

the footnotes, has been reprinted almost without change, but in an appendix of some twenty pages Mr. A. M. Duff has provided a supplementary bibliography. With this addition the book will be as useful now as it was forty years ago.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XLVIII. 2: APRIL 1953

G. L. Hendrickson, *The so-called Prelude to the Carmen Saeculare*: *Od.* iv. 6 is best regarded not as a 'prelude' composed just before the scene it represents but as an imaginative reconstruction composed later to give the poet an opportunity of recalling his part in the festival and its importance to him and of claiming the anonymous hymn as his; the Achilles passage is suggested by Pindar, *Paean* 6, and adapted from it; *pollicis ictus* is a snap of the fingers used to mark time (cf. Quint. 9. 4. 53, Terent. Maur. 2257). Roger Pack, *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Curia of Antioch*: examines and finds confirmation for Ensslin's suggestion that A. was threatened with conscription for curial service. J. A. O. Larsen, *A Thessalian Family under the Principate*: prosopographical notes on the Eubioti and Cylli of Hypata in the first three centuries; tentative conclusions regarding official careers in Roman Thessaly. P. W. Damon, *A Second Propertius Florilegium*: B. N. Fonds Latin 16708 (second half of the 14th century) contains some 70 lines of Propertius showing general affinity with the A tradition. J. F. Gilliam, *A Roman Naval Roster*: the nominal roll P. Rylands 79 is probably a navy, not an army, list; in l. 10 read <item ex?> *lib<urna> Mercur<io>*.

XLVIII. 3: JUNE 1953

J. Gwyn Griffiths, *βασιλεὺς βασιλέων, Remarks on the History of a Title*: examines the associations of the title in oriental usage. E. L. Bassett, *Silius Italicus in England*: collects quotations and references in English literature from Elyot to Gibbon. E. S. McCartney, *Antiphanes' Cold-Weather Story and its Elaboration*: collects modern parallels to the tall story (frozen words) in Plut. *Mor.* 79 a. Roger Pack, *Julian, Libanius and Others*: re-

plies to A. F. Norman's criticisms in *C.P.* xlviii. 20. A. H. Travis, *Parallels to Patavinitas*: draws attention to Cic. *Brutus* 171 on provincial *color* of the spoken word in Cisalpine Gaul. W. C. Helmbold, [*Isocr.*] *adv. Euthynum* 10: proposes ἀχρηστότερον for ἀρχαιότερον; doubts whether *Paneg.* 188 and *Ar. Rhet.* 2. 19. 14, adduced to prove genuineness, really refer to this work. Walter Allen, *The Acting Governor of Cisalpine Gaul in 63 B.C.*: Sall. *Cat.* 42. 3 and Cic. *Mur.* 89 can be reconciled on the assumption that L. Murena was governor of both Gauls in 64 and 63 as C. Calpurnius Piso probably was (see Larsen, *C.P.* xxvi, 1931, 427) in 67–65. Aubrey Diller, *A Lost Manuscript of Nonnus' Dionysiaca*: *Vat. Lat.* 5290³, fol. 19^v, a list of titles and incipits from notes made by Cyriac of Ancona on a visit to Athos in 1444, includes a Nonnus independent of the unique Laurentian and now lost.

Erratum (*C.R.* iii, 1953, 67): R. F. Willetts's proposal for Aesch. *Agam.* 1656 made in *C.P.* xlvii. 3 is *πιμωνῆς δ' ἄλις γ', ὕπαρχε· μηδὲν αἰματώμεθα* (not *αἰτιώμεθα*).

ERANOS

L (1952)

H. Frisk, *Quatres étymologies grecques*, (1) derives ἀρῶν (i.e. *φαρῶν*) from a stem meaning 'seize' (Skt. *grah-*, Arm. *gerem*) and associates it with εὐρίσκω and εἶρερον < **φερ-φερ-ον*; (2) ἀγανακτέω: **αγανάω* :: ὑλακτέω: ὑλάω; **αγανάω*: ἀγαμαι :: ἰσχανάω: ἰσχω. Similarly περιημεκτέω < **περιήμεκτος* < **περιεμέσσω* < ἐμέω, 'feel nauseated'. I. Waern, *Zur Synästhesie in griechischer Dichtung*, points out that the only common type is to treat a sound as a light; hence keep *κύπτον δέδορκα* (*A. Sept.* 103) and interpret *ὅσα λειριόσσαν* from the brilliance of lilies. G. Rudberg, *Empedokles and Evolution*, protests against attempts to read modern ideas into Empedocles.

M. P. Nilsson, *Kultische Personifikationen*, argues that before the fourth century personified abstracts (with the exception of Φήμη) have cults only when attached to the great gods, e.g. Ἀφροδίτη Πειθώ, Ἀθήνη Νίκη; later, with the decay of the old deities, they get independent status, expressing, albeit inadequately, the belief in supernatural forces. B. Hemberg, *Die Idaischen Daktylen*, gives a bibliography of ancient evidence, and argues that they were woodland dwarfs and magic smiths like their Germanic counterparts: he interprets their names and discusses their connexion with Heracles Idaios. S. Y. Rudberg describes *Codex Upsaliensis graecus 5*, which contains patristic literature, including three unknown pieces, two of pseudo-Basil and one anonymous example of the so-called *gerontica*. J. Svenning, *Brachylogie bei 'heissen' und 'nennen'*, discusses sentences where verbs of these meanings carry the implication that the object named exists, e.g. ἐνθα ἡ Τριπρυγία καλεῖται, *Umbriam qua tribum Sapi-niam uocant*, *Ulfr hét maðr*. D. Norberg, *L'origine de la versification latine rythmique*, criticizing Suchier (*Rom. Jahrb.* 1950), argues that some rhythmic poets imitated the structure of the quantitative poets of their own time; others placed a stress where there had been a long syllable; others invented their own systems: he instances a poem that has been taken for an attempt at hexameters, but which consists of rhyming hemistichs, each containing three stresses, but any number of syllables. I. Düring thinks *Thurini Calais filius Ornyti* is meant to suggest καλὰ ἔς and θούριος ὄρνις. An interesting article by U. Täckholm examines the use of the genitive of quality in Pliny's *Nat. Hist.* He shows that it is rarely used when the noun is qualified by a third-declension adjective; that it is strongly favoured with certain nouns; that it is outnumbered by the ablative in the central books, but not in the earlier or later ones. He discusses several textual problems and points out that the 'appositional' ablative, also found in Tacitus, is paralleled by an appositional genitive: they must both be developed from the constructions of quality. A. Nordh, *Virtus and Fortuna in Florus*, shows that F. frequently speaks of (*Romana*) *uirtus* up to the end of the Second Punic War, but that later (and particularly after 70 B.C.) *fortuna* is constantly the determining factor: this scheme is borrowed from Sallust. A. Boethius, *Martial's de spectaculis 2, 2*, interprets *pegmata* as the scaffolding erected either to change the head on the colossus in the vestibule of the *domus aurea* (it was originally Nero's and became that of Sol after his death) or to assist some other reconstruction of the vesti-

bule. S. Lundström shows that *charitesia* = χαριτήσια of magic papyri = 'charms'. E. Roos, *Zu Aristophanes Vesp. 1490-2* defends βαλλήσει (passive) against Platnauer *C.Q.* 1951, p. 167. G. Karlsson reports that Synesius, *epist.* 158, suspected of being un-authentic, is to be found among the letters of Nicetas Magister (banished by Romanus Lecapenus). S. Y. Rudberg has discovered that Vat. gr. 731 contains a letter by Paulus Helladicus, previously published in Lundström's *Anecdota Byzantina*. A. Boethius supports *nixae* in *Aen.* i. 446 by Pliny, *N.H.* xxxiv. 13 (bronze capitals). S. Lundström proposes <non> *consequens* at Cael. Aurel. *Cel.* i. 163. A. Wifstrand, *Det grekiska prosaspråket*, gives a brief historical summary: one may note the points that (1) hellenistic prose-writers adopt a utilitarian unindividual style; (2) the medical writers introduce the period; (3) much in Polybius that has been called chancellery Greek is Isocratean; (4) the cleft between written and spoken *koiné* is illustrated by the rarity in Polybius, and absence from Diodorus, of the historic present; (5) the second century A.D. sees the appearance of 'naivism'. Bibliographical summaries for 1950 and 1951. E. Gren lists Greek periodicals in Swedish libraries. Cumulative index to vols. i-1.

LI. 1-2 (1953)

G. Björck criticizes the incompetence and uselessness of much bibliographical work, points out that the contents of books are less amply recorded than those of periodicals, and appeals for more *Forschungsberichte*. E. N. Tigerstedt shows that D.L.'s account of Pherecydes in Sparta can be supplemented from Olympiodorus' Commentary on the *Alcibiades maior*. J. Tate rebuts R. Höistad's criticisms (*Eranos*, xlix, p. 16) of his view that Antisthenes was not an allegorist. P. M. Fraser discusses the tribal cycles of eponymous priests at Lindos and Kamiros in the light of Blinkenberg's 'triennial rule'. P. Aalto surveys the application of statistical methods to Latin literature. F. W. Lenz summarizes what has been done to identify Heinsius's manuscripts of Ovid. R. H. Martin shows that certain (but not all) typical forms of syntactical variation are more common in the later books of Tacitus' *Annals* than in his earlier work. S. Lundström supports (1) *resilire* in Irenaeus (Lat.) i. 24. 4 by examples of a similar use of *resultare*, (2) παραβιασθεῖν in Josephus, *c. Apionem* ii. 233. H. Armini suggests *tulparum* for *culparum* at *Hist. Aug. vit. Sept. Sev.* xvi. 1, to be the first occurrence in Latin of tulips.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM

VC. 4: 1952

V. Pisani, *Die oskische Defixio aus Tiriolo*, reads $\tau\rho\epsilon\beta\alpha\varsigma$ $\tau\rho\epsilon\beta\alpha\rho\iota\epsilon\varsigma$ $\nu\upsilon\mu\upsilon\mu\iota$ $\alpha\lambda\alpha\phi\iota\upsilon\omicron\mu$ and translates *Trebas Trebatius Numerium Alfium*. A. Klotz, *Zum Rudens des Plautus*: III. III is an interpolation by Plautus into the version of Diphilus. R. Merkelbach, *Bettelgedichte* (*Theokrit, Simonides und Walther von der Vogelweide*): the vagrant, mendicant poet was well known in the early times of the Greeks, Indians, and Germans. U. Albin, *L'orazione lisiana per l'invalido*: Lys. xxiv is a pleasant *divertissement* founded on irony. F. Zucker, *Simaristos*: the name is characteristically Illyrian in formation. F. Miltner, *Der Tacitusbericht über Idistaviso*: the battle was not a victory for the Romans, but frustrated their thrust to the Elbe and influenced Tiberius in his decision to break off the war. A. Lesky, *Fabula crepidata*: is Roman tragedy in Greek dress. H. Hunger, *Euripides, Andromache 147-153 und die Auftrittsszenen in der attischen Tragödie*: 154 is an actors' interpolation. L. Deubner, *Die Gebräuche der Griechen nach der Geburt*: suggests that originally girls were named on the seventh, boys on the tenth, day after birth, but this distinction was later ignored. A. von Gerkan, *Zur Belagerungsmauer von Plataiai*: defends his thesis (*R.M.* xciii, 1950, 379 f.) against O. Walter (*La Nouvelle Clío*, iii, 1951, 297 f.).

XCVI. 1: 1953

H. Herter, *Die Rundform in Platons Atlantis und ihre Nachwirkung in der Villa Hadriani*: the Teatro Marittimo is an imitation of the centre of Plato's Atlantis. A. von Gerkan, *Zum Suburaproblem*: the original settlement was in the Subura and the name extended with it to the Mons Caelius. The Septimontium was a festival of the original Latin community, excluding the Sabines on the Quirinal. W. Kranz, *Das Lied des Kitharoden von Jaffa* (*Virgil, Aeneis i 740 ff.*): represents ancient 'barbarian' lore and forms part of the contrast with the civilization destined for Rome. H. Erbse, *Über eine Eigenheit der thukydeischen Geschichtsbetrachtung*: while the reader of Herodotus remains at one point in Time as the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota$ unfold before him, the reader of Thucydides is obliged to change his point of view in order to grasp the complexity of the Past and the causality underlying it. A. Klotz, *Caesar und Livius*: Caes. B.G. served

as a stylistic model for Livy, whose text can therefore be used to determine Caesar's text: so read *pro magnis* B.G. I. 43. 4, *virtute* vii. 84. 4, *nec eatur cum periculo et . . . augetur* v. 31. 5. H. Heusch, *Zum Proömium von Ciceros Laelius*: argues for the unity of the Prooemium. R. Stark, *Sokratisches in den 'Vögeln' des Aristophanes*: Ar. mocks Socrates' optimistic ethics in Av. 603 f., his irony in 1210, his absurd behaviour in 1282, and his $\psi\upsilon\chi\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\iota\lambda\alpha$ in 1553 f. V. Pisani, *Die römischen Zahlzeichen, ein älteres römisches Alphabet und lat. Mille*: the Roman numerals derive from an old Etruscan alphabet in which C = k(g), F = f, Φ = h, V = k, X = t(d), Ψ = k, and are in origin initials. E. Bickel, *Salaputium: Mentula salax*: this interpretation is supported by Suet. Vit. Hor. p. 45 R. F. Zucker, *Lydda-Lunda: Λοῦνδα* found in papyri between A.D. 317 and 323 is an instance of Greek nasalization of a Semitic double dental.

XCVI. 2: 1953

S. Gutenbrunner, *Ariovist und Caesar*: Caes. B.G. I. 51 ff. is intended to suggest the annihilation of Ariovistus' force: in fact only the wings were involved in the rout, while the centre (composed of the tribes settled west of the Rhine) was deliberately left untouched. W. Schmid, *Tityrus Christianus: Endecheus' poem* (*Anth. Lat.* ed. Buecheler-Riese, I. 2². 893) is not a freak, but directly connected with the thought of the age. W. Capelle, *Zwei Quellen des Heliodor*: Heliodorus takes his ethnological material from Artemidorus, who in turn relies on Agatharchides; and from Phylarchus his theory of $\beta\alpha\sigma\kappa\alpha\upsilon\lambda\alpha$, which derives ultimately from Democritus. V. Pisani, *Zur lateinischen Wortgeschichte salaputium, Subura: salaputium* is Oscan in origin and to be connected with Lat. *sal* + **pau-* / *pū-* and meant originally *salt-pestle*, the shape of which accounts for the metaphorical use of the word. *Subura* is Sabine from **su-g*ou-rā* = pasture for pigs and cattle. R. Stark, *Catos Rede de lustris sui felicitate*: Paneg. Lat. (ed. Bährens) v. 13. 3 determines neither the title nor the occasion of Cato's speech. L. Koenen, *Bemerkungen zum Tyrtaiosfragment 1*: rejects the combination of Wilamowitz's frags. A, B, C into a connected text in Diehl³. W. Kranz, *Das ius controversum: i.e.* is a term from Rhetoric. G. C. Whittick, *Petronius 77. 4: hospitium* is nominative, and *capit* = 'affords accommodation for'.

NOTES AND NEWS

THE second Classical Congress organized by the *Fédération Internationale des Associations d'Études Classiques* will be held in Copenhagen from 23 to 28 August 1954. Its main theme will be 'The Classical Pattern of Modern Western Civilisation', and papers on various aspects of this theme ('The Shaping of the Mind', 'The Pattern of Thought', 'Moral Ideas', 'Linguistics', 'Portraiture', 'Town Planning') to be presented at the Congress will be circulated to members in advance. There will also be lectures on ancient music, mathematics, historiography, and law in relation to modern civilization and, outside the central theme, on current developments in various fields of research (such as the languages of prehistoric Greece and primitive Italian religion) and on recent archaeological, epigraphical, and papyrological discoveries. One session will be devoted to the commemoration of Madvig, the 150th anniversary of whose birth falls just before the opening of the Congress. Further details of the programme will be published early in 1954.

We have received vol. i (1953) of *Studia Oliveriana*, a journal published at Pesaro and devoted primarily to 'studi d'argomento locale', of which that town has a long tradition. An article by M. Zicari deals with a manuscript of Catullus, No. 1167 in the Biblioteca Oliveriana at Pesaro, written in 1470, and its relation to other *recentiores*.

It is of the nature of *Festschriften* not to lend themselves readily to review. The volume of studies presented to Gilbert Norwood (see p. 225) to mark his seventieth birthday and his retirement from the Directorship of Classical Studies in University College, Toronto, is particularly intractable: for it reflects the many-sided interests of the recipient in the miscellaneity of the thirty papers (sixteen from Canada, eight from Britain, and six from the United States) which it contains. Of Greek authors, Homer, Theognis, the three tragedians, Antiphon, Plato, Menander, and Clement all find a place; of Latin, Lucretius, Virgil, Horace, Seneca, Petronius, and Tacitus. Besides these, there are contributions on historical and more general subjects. To deal with this variety at once adequately and within our space is beyond us; *quod possumus*, we add our own expression of esteem for a distinguished and versatile scholar.

Volume ii of *Studies presented to David M. Robertson* outdoes volume i (see p. 49 above). There are 150 contributors, whose articles range over the fields of vase-painting, epigraphy, numismatics, linguistics, literature, history, religion; the book contains 1334 pages (with 98 plates) and weighs over 9 lb. To attempt to review such a collection would be ridiculous, but the general remarks which were made here with reference to vol. i might well be repeated. Regret that articles embedded in a *Festschrift* are doomed to be lost to sight is tempered by the reflection that that does not always matter very much.

Les Langues du Monde, which was first published in 1924 under the general editorship of M. Cohen and the late A. Meillet, has appeared in a revised and greatly expanded edition, directed by the surviving editor with the co-operation of specialists, under the auspices of the Centre National de la Recherche

Scientifique. In its new form the work extends to nearly 1300 pages and there is an accompanying atlas of 21 linguistic maps. The method and arrangement of the original book have been maintained but much has been rewritten and much new bibliographical and other matter has been introduced.

The Polish monthly classical journal *Meander* for 1952 devotes an article to Classical Philology in the Soviet Union, from which it appears that the Universities of Leningrad and Lwow, the Pedagogic Institute of Moscow, and the smaller classical departments of the Universities of Kharkov, Kazan, Tiflis, and Tomsk are responsible for considerable publishing activity. At Leningrad work is in progress on a Russian Bibliography of Classical Philology from the beginning of the eighteenth century; at Moscow Professor Deratari is examining the problem of the origin of the *Res Gestae*; at Lwow Professor Pastuszyn has shown that the Slavs are autochthonous in Europe as Pliny, Tacitus, and Ptolemy believed.

The vehicle for the publication of all articles, translations, and dissertations is the *Herald of Ancient History* which has appeared regularly since 1937. All philological books are reviewed in the same journal. The books themselves are rarely seen outside Russia. The many titles mentioned by the Polish writer cover History, Literature (including translations and commentaries), Religion, and Epigraphy and show that particular attention is paid to foreign publications (e.g. de Romilly's *Impérialisme Athenienne*, Tarn's *Hellenistic Civilization*). 'Soviet Classical Philology', he says, 'can congratulate itself on having in the seven post-war years mobilized its classical experts, trained new cadres, and filled many vacancies for qualified teachers of Latin in middle schools'.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.

Andrew (S. O.) *Homer: The Odyssey* translated. (Everyman's Library.) Pp. xviii + 309. London: Dent, 1953. Cloth, 6s. net.

Argenti (P. P.) *The Costumes of Chios*. Pp. xii + 338; 111 plates. London: Batsford, 1953. Cloth, £10. 10s. net.

Arns (E.) *La technique du livre d'après Saint Jérôme*. Pp. 220. Paris: de Boccard, 1953. Paper, 950 fr.

Bell (H. I.) *Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. (Farwood Lectures, 1952.) Pp. x + 117. Liverpool: University Press, 1953. Cloth, 15s. net.

Böhme (R.) *Orpheus: das Alter des Kitharoden*. Pp. 138. Berlin: Weidmann, 1953. Paper, DM. 13.

British Academy. *Proceedings: Vol. XXXVII* (1951). Pp. 372. London: Oxford University Press, 1953. Cloth, 50s. net.

Brogan (O.) *Roman Gaul*. Pp. x + 250; 16 plates, 35 figs., map. London: Bell, 1953.

Cloth, 21s. net.

Brommer (F.) *Herakles: die zwölf Taten des Helden in antiker Kunst und Literatur*. Pp. 103; 32 plates. Cologne: Böhlau-Verlag, 1953. Paper, DM. 12.80.

Calabi (I.) *Ricerche sui rapporti fra le poleis*. Pp. viii + 168. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1953. Paper, L. 700.

Campbell (A. Y.) *Horace: Odes and Epodes*. Re-edited with English notes. Pp. xxiii + 202. Liverpool: University Press, 1953. Cloth, 20s. net.

Cazzaniga (I.) (1) *Incerti auctoris De Lapsu Susannae*. (Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum.) Pp. lxvii + 81. (2) *La tradizione manoscritta del De Lapsu Susannae con nuovo apparato critico*. Pp. 66. Turin: Paravia, 1953. Paper, (together) L. 650.

Chadwick (H.) *Origen: Contra Celsum*. Translated with an introduction and

- notes. Pp. xl+531. Cambridge: University Press, 1953. Cloth, 60s. net.
- Clarke* (M. L.) *Rhetoric at Rome: a historical survey*. Pp. vii+203. London: Cohen & West, 1953. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* U.S.A., fasc. 11: Metropolitan Museum of Art, fasc. 2: Attic Black-Figured Kylikes. By G. M. A. Richter. Pp. xvii+22; 42 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1953. Portfolio, 32s. 6d. net.
- Cytowska* (M.) *De Dionis Chrysostomi rhythmo oratorio*. Pp. 53. Warsaw: Ministry of Education, 1952. Paper, zł. 12.
- De Jonge* (P.) *Philological and historical commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus* xv. 6-13. Pp. 82. Groningen: Wolters, 1953. Paper, fl. 2.90.
- de Vogel* (C. J.) *Greek Philosophy. Vol. II: Aristotle, the Early Peripatetic School and the Early Academy*. Pp. 337. Leiden: Brill, 1953. Cloth, 12.50 g.
- Enk* (P. J.) *Plauti Truculentus cum prolegomenis, notis criticis, commentario exegetico*. Vol. I: pp. 116. Vol. II: pp. 230. Leiden: Sijthoff, 1953. Cloth, fl. 34.
- Errandonea* (I.) *El Estasio Segundo del Edipo Rey de Sofocles*. (Instituto de Lenguas Clásicas, Textos y Estudios, 3.) Pp. 84. La Plata: Universidad Nacional, 1952. Paper.
- Evans* (E.) *Saint Augustine's Enchiridion*. Translated with introduction and notes. Pp. xxvii+146. London: S.P.C.K., 1953. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Friedrich* (W. H.) *Euripides und Diphilos*. (Zetemata, Heft 5.) Pp. viii+280. Munich: Beck, 1953. Paper, DM. 22.50.
- Giancotti* (F.) *Virgilio: Le Bucoliche*. Saggio introduttivo, testo criticamente riveduto e traduzione. Pp. 145. Rome: Tumminelli, 1953. L. 1300.
- Gordon* (A. E.) *Quintus Veranius, Consul A.D. 49: a study based upon his recently identified sepulchral inscription*. (Publications in Classical Archaeology, Vol. 2, No. 5.) Pp. vii+121; 8 plates. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1952. Paper, \$1.75.
- Gould* (H. E.) and *Whiteley* (J. L.) (1) *The Helvetian War (De Bello Gallico i. 1-29)*. Pp. xxv+118; 4 ill. (2) *Horace: Odes, Book iii*. Pp. xxv+179; 12 ill. (3) *Vergil: Aeneid, Book, viii*. Pp. xxviii+163; 12 ill. (Modern School Classics.) London: Macmillan, 1953. Cloth, 3s. 6d., 4s., 4s. net.
- Gow* (A. S. F.) and *Scholfield* (A. F.) *Nicander: the Poems and Poetical Fragments*. Edited with a translation and notes. Pp. xii+247. Cambridge: University Press, 1953. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Grimal* (P.) *Les intentions de Propertius et la composition du livre iv des Élégies*. Pp. 56. (Collection Latomus, vol. xii.) Brussels: Latomus, 1953. Paper, 60 B.fr.
- Guthrie* (W. K. C.) *Greek Philosophy: the Hub and the Spokes*. (Inaugural Lecture.) Pp. 29. Cambridge: University Press, 1953. Paper, 3s. net.
- Hahn* (E. A.) *Subjunctive and Optative: their Origin as Futures*. (Philological Monographs, No. XVI.) Pp. xviii+157. New York: American Philological Association (Oxford: Blackwell), 1953. Cloth, \$5.
- Hill* (I. T.) *The Ancient City of Athens*. Pp. xi+258; 2 plates, 34 figs. London: Methuen, 1953. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Hope* (R.) *Aristotle's Metaphysics newly translated*. Pp. xvii+394. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1953. Cloth, 32s. 6d. net.
- Johnson* (S.) *Selected Odes of Horace translated into English verse*. Pp. xii+84. Toronto: University Press for the University of Manitoba (London: Oxford University Press), 1951. Cloth, 22s. net.
- Le Bonniec* (H.) *Plinie l'Ancien: Histoire Naturelle, livre XXXIV. Texte établi e traduit par H. Le B., commenté par H. Gallet de Santerre et H. le B.* (Collection Budé.) Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1953. Paper.
- Loenen* (D.) *Polemos: een Studie over Oorlog in de griekse Oudheid*. (Med. der K. Nederlandse Akad., Afd. Letterkunde, N.R. 16. 3) Pp. 97. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Mij., 1953. Paper, fl. 4.
- Lundström* (S.) *Zur Historia Tripartita des Cassiodor*. (Lunds Universitetets Årsskrift, N.F., Avd. 1, Bd. 49, Nr. 1.) Pp. 32. Lund: Gleerup, 1953. Paper, kr. 3.25.
- Maguinness* (W. S.) *Virgil: Aeneid XII*. Pp. 119. London: Methuen, 1953. Cloth, 5s. 9d. (with vocabulary, 6s. 9d.)
- Manni* (E.) *Plutarchi Vita Demetri Poliorcetis*. Introduzione, commento e appendice. Pp. xxvi+128. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1953. Paper, L. 1300.
- Marcus* (R.) *Philo: Supplement. I: Questions and Answers on Genesis*. Pp. xx+551. II: *Questions and Answers on Exodus*. Pp. viii+307. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1953. Cloth, 15s. net each.
- Marsh* (F. B.) *History of the Roman World, 146-30 B.C.* Revised by H. H. Scullard. Pp. xii+467; 5 maps. London: Methuen, 1953. Cloth, 30s. net.

- Meander*. Rok VII (1952): 6-7, 8, 9, 10. Warsaw: Uniwersytet, Wydział Humanistyczny, 1952. Paper, zł. 6, 3, 3, 3.
- Meillet (A.), Cohen (M.), (ed.)* Les langues du Monde. Nouvelle édition. Pp. xlii+1296; 21 maps. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1952. Cloth.
- Meritt (B. D.), Wade Gery (H. T.), and Macgregor (M. F.)* The Athenian Tribute Lists. Vol. IV. Pp. xii+278. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1953. Cloth, \$10.
- Merlan (P.)* From Platonism to Neoplatonism. Pp. xvi+210. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1952. Paper, fl. 12.
- Metzger (H.)* La céramique grecque. (Que Sais-Je ?, No. 588.) Pp. 112. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1953. Paper, 150 fr.
- Michelakis (E.)* Platons Lehre von der Anwendung des Gesetzes und der Begriff der Billigkeit bei Aristoteles. Pp. 52. Munich: Hüber, 1953. Paper.
- Mugnier (R.)* Aristote: Petits Traités d'Histoire Naturelle. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé.) Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1953. Paper.
- Myres (J. L.)* Herodotus, Father of History. Pp. vii+315. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Nash Williams (A. N.)* Hannibal in Defeat: selections from Livy xxv-xxx. (Modern School Classics.) Pp. xxvi+137; ill. London: Macmillan, 1953. Cloth, 4s.
- Norwood (G.), Studies in Honour of.* Edited by M. A. White. (The Phoenix, Supplementary vol. I.) Pp. xvii+278. Toronto: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1953. Cloth, 48s. net.
- Numminen (P.)* Quo modo Cicero de Lucretio (et quodam Sallustio) indicaverit. (Annales Universitatis Turkuensis, B. xlv. 1.) Pp. 42. Helsinki: Akateeminen Kirjakauppa, 1953. Paper, mk. 125.
- Nygren (A.)* Agape and Eros. Translated by P. S. Watson. Pp. xxvi+764. London: S.P.C.K., 1953. Cloth, 35s. net.
- Opuscula Archaeologica*, Vol. VII. (Skifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom, 49, xvi.) Pp. vii+171; 65 plates, 30 figs. Lund: Gleerup, 1952. Paper, Kr. 70.
- Opuscula Atheniensia* I. (Skifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen, 49, ii.) Pp. 236; 11 plates, 71 figs. Lund: Gleerup, 1953. Paper, Kr. 75.
- Paul (A.)* Untersuchungen zur Eigenart von Senecas Phoenissen. Pp. 119. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1953. Cloth, DM. 6.80.
- Penny (J.)* Latin Lyrics Translated. Pp. 173. London: Regency Press, 1953. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Perek (F. Z.)* İzahlı Lâtince-Türkçe Sözlük. Bölüm 1 (a-deb). Pp. xiv+376. Constantinople: İbrahim Horoz Başimevi, 1952. Paper, 588 krş.
- Pettazzoni (R.)* La religione nella Grecia antica. Pp. 282; 14 plates. Turin: Einaudi, 1953. Paper, L. 500.
- Pfeiffer (R.)* Callimachus. Vol. II: Hymni et Epigrammata. Pp. cviii+208. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953. Cloth, 42s. net.
- Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.)* The Dramatic Festivals of Athens. Pp. xxi+334; 207 ill. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953. Cloth, 50s. net.
- Pratesi (A.)* Terenzio: Commedie. II: Formione, La Suocera, I Due Fratelli. Prefazione, testo critico, e traduzione. Pp. 335. Rome: Tumminelli, 1953. L. 2500.
- Raeder (H.)* Ein Problem in griechischer Syntax: die Verbindung der Partikel *äv* mit Futurum. (K. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Hist.-filol. Medd., 33. 5.) Pp. 14. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1953. Paper, kr. 2.
- Raymond (D.)* Macedonian Regal Coinage to 413 B.C. (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 126.) Pp. xi+170; 15 plates. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1953. Paper, \$4.50.
- Reimer (P. J.)* Zeven tegen Thebe: pracheleense elemente in de helleene traditie. Pp. 130. Gouda: Kock & Knuttel, 1953. Paper.
- Rémy (Y.), Dunil-Marquebreucq (R.)* Érasme: Dulce bellum inexpertis. Texte édité et traduit. (Collection Latomus, vol. viii.) Pp. 112. Brussels: Latomus, 1953. Paper, 125 B.fr.
- Rieu (E. V.)* Homer: the Iliad translated. Pp. xxv+466. London: Methuen, 1953. Cloth, 25s. net. [First published in Penguin Books in 1950: see C.R. lkv. 236.]
- Robert (F.)* Exploration Archéologique de Délos: Trois Sanctuaires sur le rivage occidental. Pp. 119; 79 plates. Paris: de Boccard, 1952. Cloth and boards.
- Rouillard (G.)* La vie rurale dans l'empire byzantine. Pp. 207. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1953. Paper.
- Rumpf (A.)* Malerei und Zeichnung. (Handbuch der Archäologie, Lief. 6 = Hbuch d. Altertumswissenschaft VI. iv. 1.) Pp. xxxvi+199; 72 plates, 21 figs. Munich: Beck, 1953. Paper, DM. 38.
- Schlumberger (D.)* Trésors monétaires d'Afghanistan. (Mémoires de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan, Vol. 14.) Pp. 134; 16 plates. Paris: Klincksieck, 1953. Paper, 2200 fr.
- Schwyzer (E.)* Griechische Grammatik. Dritter Band: Register, von D. J. Georgacas.

- Pp. xxiii+392. Munich: Beck, 1953. Cloth.
- Shipp* (G. P.) *Studies in the Language of Homer*. Pp. x+155. Cambridge: University Press, 1953. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Shoe* (L. T.) *Profiles of Western Greek Mouldings*. (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, XIV.) Pp. 191; 10 plates; 32 plates in separate portfolio. Rome: American Academy, 1952. Paper.
- Snell* (B.) *The Discovery of the Mind: the Greek Origins of European Thought*. Translated by T. G. Rosenmeyer. Pp. xii+324. Oxford: Blackwell, 1953. Cloth, 27s. 6d. net.
- Starr* (C. G.) *The Emergence of Rome as Ruler of the Western World*. Second Edition. Pp. ix+122. Ithaca: Cornell University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1953. Paper, 8s. net.
- Stolz* (F.)—*Debrunner* (A.) *Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache*. Dritte, stark umgearbeitete Auflage. (Sammlung Götschen, Bd. 492.) Pp. 136. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1953. Paper, DM. 2.40.
- Studies presented to D. M. Robinson on his seventieth birthday*. Vol. II. Pp. xx+1336; 98 plates. St. Louis: Washington University, 1953. Cloth.
- Svennung* (J.) *Belt und Baltische. Ostseeische Namenstudien mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Adam von Bremen*. (Uppsala Universitetets Årsskrift, 1953/4.) Pp. 98. Uppsala: Lundeqvist, 1953. Paper, 9 kr.
- Szelest* (H.) *De Pausaniae clausulis*. Pp. 39. Warsaw: Ministry of Education, 1953. Paper, zł. 11.
- Thomes* (F. C.) *Egemonia beotica e potenza maritima nella politica di Epaminonda*. (Università di Torino, Publ. della Facoltà di Lett. e Fil., IV. 4.) Pp. 54. Turin: Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, 1952. Paper, L. 350.
- Thomson* (H. J.) *Prudentius*. Vol. II (C. Symm., Perist., Ditt.) (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. 386. London: Heinemann, 1953. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Továr* (A.) *Aristoteles: Retorica*. Edición del texto con aparato crítico, traducción, prólogo y notas. Pp. xlviii+245. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1953. Paper, 100 ptas.
- University of North Carolina*. *The Septicennial Celebration of the Founding of the Sorbonne College in the University of Paris*, February 1953: *Proceedings and Papers*. Pp. 49. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina, 1953. Paper.
- van de Woestijne* (P.) *La Périégèse de Priscien*. Edition critique. Pp. 153. Bruges: 'De Tempel', 1953. Paper.
- van Groningen* (B. A.) *In the Grip of the Past*. Essay on an aspect of Greek thought. (Philosophia Antiqua, VI.) Pp. xii+126. Leiden: Brill, 1953. Paper, fl. 8.50.
- van Groningen* (B. A.) *La poésie verbale grecque: essai de mise au point*. (Medd. d. K. Ned. Akad. v. Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, N. R., 16. 4.) Pp. 100. Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Mij., 1953. Paper, fl. 4.50.
- Vellacott* (P.) *Euripides: Three Plays (Hippolytus, Iphigenia in Tauris, Alcestis)*. A new translation. Pp. 165. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1953. Paper, 2s. net.
- Wagenvoort* (H.) *Vergilius' Ecloga I en IX*. (Mededelingen van de K. Vlaamse Academie, Klasse der Letteren, xv. 3.) Pp. 39. Brussels: R. Flemish Academy, 1953. Paper.
- Welin* (E.) *Studien zur Topographie des Forum Romanum*. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom, 8°, vi.) Pp. 232; 9 figs. Lund: Gleerup, 1953. Paper, Kr. 25.
- Werhahn* (H. M.) *Gregorii Nazianzeni Σύγκρισις Βίων*. (Klassisch-Philologische Studien, Heft 15.) Pp. ix+104. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1953. Paper, DM. 9.
- Winniczuk* (L.) *Epistolografia. Łacińskie podręczniki epistolograficzne w Polsce w xv-xvi wieku*. Warsaw: Ministry of Education, 1953. Paper, zł. 12.
- Young* (S. P.) *The Women of Greek Drama*. Pp. 174. New York: Exposition Press, 1953. Cloth, \$3.50.
- Zuntz* (G.) *The Text of the Epistles. A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum*. (Schweich Lectures, 1946.) Pp. xvii+295. London: Oxford University Press, 1953. Cloth, 27s. 6d. net.

INDEX

I. GENERAL INDEX

- Agard's *Classical Myths in Sculpture*, 127
 Åkerström's *Architektonische Terrakottaplatten in Stockholm*, 211
Allan (D. J.) on Hoffmann's *Griechische Philosophie bis Platon*, 55
 Ammendola's *Euripide, Medea*, 54
 Angel's *Troy: The Human Remains*, 216
animus, 32
 aorist in $\mu\eta$ clauses, 2
 Ares, trial of, 80
 Atkins's *Literary Criticism in Antiquity* (new edition), 66
auctoritas, 11
 Augustan Constitution, 10
- Baldry's *Greek Literature for the Modern Reader*, 87
Barker (E.) on Brandenstein's *Atlantis*, 56;
 on Marias's *Aristóteles, Política*, 117
Beattie (A. J.) Pindar, *Isthmia* i 41: 77
 Beazley's *The Development of Attic Black-Figure*, 128
Bell (H. I.) on Kenyon's *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome* 2nd edition, 53
 Blanken's *Les Grecs de Cargèse* (I), 130
 Blegen, Caskey, and Rawson's *Troy* (II), 216
 Bonazzi's *Propertius Resartus*, 101
Bonner (S. F.) Lucan iv 457 ff.: 13; on Boulogne's *De Plaats van de Paedagogus in de Romeinse Cultuur*, 58
 BOOKS RECEIVED, 70, 134, 223
 Boulogne's *De Plaats van de Paedagogus in de Romeinse Cultuur*, 58
Bradley (D. R.) on Jones's *An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings*, 174
 Braga's *Catullo e i poeti greci*, 202
 Brandenstein's *Atlantis*, 56
Brogan (O.) on John's *Die Örtlichkeit der Varusschlacht*, 213
 Broughton's *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* (I), 111
Brown (A. D. F.) on Whitman's *Sophocles*, and other Sophoclean studies, 150
Browning (R.) Cicero, *De Oratore* iii 78: 144; on Thompson's *A Roman Reformer and Inventor*, 106; on Oświecimski's *De scriptorum Romanorum vestigiis apud Tertullianum obviis*, 123; on Gjurić's *Istorija Helenske Književnosti*, 193; on Laidlaw's *Latin Literature*, 201; on Labourt's *Saint Jérôme, Lettres* (II), 204
 Büchner and Hofmann's *Lateinische Literatur und Sprache in der Forschung seit 1937*, 200
 Budde's *Jugendbildnisse des Caracalla und Geta*, 213
 Budé Texts: Cicero, *Speeches* (XVIII), 173; Herodotus, *Book VII*, 116; Plato (XI), 96; Prudentius (IV), 123; St. Jerome, *Letters* (II), 204
Burn (A. R.) on Corti's *The Destruction and Resurrection of Pompeii and Herculaneum*, 64;
 on Gitti's *Alessandro Magno all' Oasi di Siwah*, 125
 Buschor's *Maussollos und Alexander*, 60
- Cadoux (T. J.)** on Levi's *Suetoni Divus Augustus*, 104; on Levi's *Il tempo di Augusto*, 181
Campbell (A. Y.) *Anth. Pal.* v 244 (245) 3-4: 13; Aristophanes, *Frogs* 818-21: 137
Cary (M.) on Robinson's *Ancient History*, 39
 Certamen Capitolinum (third), 133
Cherniss (H.), Letter on Plato, *Symp.* 208 a-b: 131
Chilver (G. E. F.) on Scullard's *Roman Politics*, 220-150 B.C., 179; on Gasparotto's *Padova Romana*, 188; on Scullard's *A History of the Roman World, 753-146 B.C.*, 212
 Cilentos Plotino, *Enneadi*, 163
 Clairmont's *Das Parisurteil in der antiken Kunst*, 212
 Classical Philology summarized (XLVII 2-4), 66; (XLVIII 1), 132; (XLVIII 2, 3), 219
 Cloché's *La Démocratie athénienne*, 41
 Cohen and Meillet's *Les Langues du Monde* revised edition, 222
 Coleman-Norton and others' *Studies in Honor of A. C. Johnson*, 186
 Continental publications, announcements of, 134
Cook (R. M.) on *Studies presented to D. M. Robinson* (I), 49; on Herbig and others' *Vermächtnis der antiken Kunst*, 61; on Agard's *Classical Myths in Sculpture*, 127; on Scranton's *Corinth* (I part iii), 128; on Roebuck's *Corinth* (XIV), 129; on Lippold's *Die griechische Plastik*, 190; on *Festgabe für A. von Salis*, 209; on Richter's *Three Critical Periods in Greek Sculpture*, 210; on Åkerström's *Architektonische Terrakottaplatten in Stockholm*, 211; on Clairmont's *Das Parisurteil in der antiken Kunst*, 212
 Cooper's *An Introduction to the Latin Hexameter*, 167
 'Corinthian War', outbreak of, 6
Corpus Christianorum, appearance of first vol. of, 133
 Corti's *The Destruction and Resurrection of Pompeii and Herculaneum*, 64
Crook (J. A.) Some remarks on the Augustan Constitution, 10
 Crosby's *Dio Chrysostom, Discourses lxi-lxxx*, 120
 Crouzet's *Nouvelle Méthode Lafine und Nouvelle Grammaire Latine*, 192
- Davis's *Race-Relationships in Ancient Egypt*, 44
Davison (J. A.) *Ox. Pap.* 2256, fr. 3: 144; on Page's *Alcman's Partheneion*, 16; on Merkelbach's *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee*, 14; on Mette's *Der Pfeilschuß des Pandaros*, 53; on Waern's *Ἰῆς 'Οορέα*, 54; on Trümper's *Kriegerische Fachausdrücke im griechischen*

- Epos*, 148; on Rank's *Etymologiseering en verwante Verschijnselen bij Homerus*, 195
- Dawkins (R. M.)** on Paton's *Chapters on Mediaeval and Renaissance Visitors to Greek Lands*, 57; on Blanken's *Les Grecs de Cargèse* (I), 130
- de Jonge's *Ovidii Tristium liber iv*, 103
- de Lepper's *De Godsdienst der Romeinen*, 124
- de Man's *In Grammaticis Veritas*, 51
- de Montmollin's *La Poétique d'Aristote*, 98
- De Sanctis's *Studi di Storia della Storiografia greca*, 37
- des Places, Diès, and Gernet's *Platon, Les Lois i-vi*, 96
- Dilke (O. A. W.)** on de Jonge's *Ovidii Tristium liber iv*, 103
- diminutives, Latin, 107
- Dodds (E. R.)** on Zucker's *Plotin und Lykopolis*, 56
- Dodds's *The Greeks and the Irrational*, 82
- Dornseiff's *Verschmähtes zu Vergil, Horaz und Properz*, 169
- Drerup's *Ägyptische Bildnisköpfe griechischer und römische Zeit*, 209
- Duff's *A Literary History of Rome* (i), 2nd edition, 218
- Dumbarton Oaks Papers* (V), 63
- Dupréel's *Les Sophistes*, 155
- Düring's *Chion of Heraclea*, 100
- Edwards (M.)** on some school books, 192
- Edwards (W. M.)** The Ram and Cerberus, 142
- elephants, Carthaginians' use of, 140
- epic, word-forms in Greek, 73
- Eranos* summarized (L), 219; (LI 1, 2), 220
- Farrington (B.)** on Neugebauer's *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity*, 207
- Fédération Internationale des Associations d'Études Classiques, second Congress of, 222
- Festgabe für A. von Salis*, 209
- Fine's *Horoi*, 109
- Forbes (P. B. R.)** on Fine's *Horoi*, 109
- Fordyce (C. J.)** on Jones's *Pliny, Natural History xx-xxiii*, 121; on Löfstedt's *Coniectanea*, 124; on Braga's *Catullo e i poeti greci*, 202; on Kelling and Suskin's *Index Verborum Iuvenalis*, 204
- Foster and Humphries's *Aristotle's De Anima*, 119
- François's *Ciceronis Cato Maior de Senectute Liber*, 203
- Fränkel's *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*, 146
- Fraser (P. M.)** on Sundwall's *Kleinasiatische Nachträge*, 42; on Coleman-Norton and others' *Studies in Honor of A. C. Johnson*, 186; on Manni's *Demetrio Poliorcete*, 208
- Fuchs's *Tacitus, Annales*, 27
- Gasparotto's *Padova Romana*, 188
- Giarratano's *Martialis Epigrammaton Libri XIV* 2nd edition, 171
- Gitti's *Alessandro Magno all' Oasi di Siwah*, 125
- Gjurić's *Istorija Helenske Književnosti*, 193
- Goheen's *The Imagery of Sophocles' Antigone*, 150
- Gomme (A. W.)** on De Sanctis's *Studi di Storia della Storiografia greca*, 37; on Jacoby's *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (III B), 89; on Maddalena's *Thucydides Historiarum liber primus*, 158
- Gossage (A. J.)** on Theander's *Plutarch und die Geschichte*, 198
- Griffith (J. G.)** on Thierfelder's *Plautus, Rudens and Terentius, Andria*, 121
- Grimal's *Dictionnaire de la mythologie grecque et romaine*, 34
- Hakamies's *Étude sur l'origine et l'évolution du diminutif latin*, 107
- Hamilton's *The Symposium of Plato*, 117
- Hammond (N. G. L.)** on Cloché's *La Démocratie athénienne*, 41; on Hammond's *City-state and World-state in Greek and Roman Political Theory*, 45
- Hammond's (M.) *City-state and World-state in Greek and Roman Political Theory*, 45
- Harrison (E. L.)** The origin of *θυμοειδής*, 138
- Hartke's *Römische Kinderkaiser*, 47
- Herald of Ancient History* (Soviet journal), 223
- Herbig and others' *Vermächtnis der antiken Kunst*, 61
- Hermann's *L'Âge d'Argent doré*, 169
- Hoffmann's *Griechische Philosophie bis Platon*, 55
- Holley (N. M.)** The aorist in *μή* clauses, 2
- Homeyer's *Attila der Hunnenkönig*, 217
- Hopper (R. J.)** on Walser's *Rom, das Reich und die fremden Völker*, 59; on Steidle's *Sueton und die antike Biographie*, 122; on Lewis and Reinhold's *Roman Civilisation* (I), 214; on Lacroix's *L'Histoire dans l'Antiquité* and McDermott and Caldwell's *Readings in the History of the Ancient World*, 215
- Huber's *Platons dialektische Ideenlehre nach dem zweiten Teil der 'Parmenides'*, 196
- Hudson-Williams (A.)** *Culex* 272-6: 80; on Giarratano's *Martialis Epigrammaton Libri XIV* 2nd edition, 171; on McKinlay's *Aratoris Subdiaconi De Actibus Apostolorum*, 206
- Hudson-Williams (H. Ll.)** on Düring's *Chion of Heraclea*, 100; on Crosby's *Dio Chrysostom, Discourses lxi-lxxx*, 120; on Martinazzoli's *La 'Successio' di Marco Aurelio*, 120; on Ronnet's *Étude sur le style de Démosthène dans les discours politiques*, 161; on Schwartz's *Lucien, Philopseudes et De Morte Peregrini*, 198
- Huibregtse's *Xenophon, Anabasis*, 117
- Hussey (J. M.)** on *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* (V), 63
- Huxley (H. H.)** on Dornseiff's *Verschmähtes zu Vergil, Horaz und Properz* and Hermann's *L'Âge d'Argent doré*, 169
- imperator*, 11
- Jacoby's *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (III B), 89

- Joachim's *Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*, 20
 John's *Die Örtlichkeit der Varusschlacht*, 213
 Johnson's *Egypt and the Roman Empire*, 184
 Johnstone's *Annales Gandenses*, 130
Jones (A. H. M.) on Manni's *L'Impero di Gallieni*, 60; on Mazzarino's *Aspetti Sociali del Quarto Secolo*, 113; on Tarn and Griffith's *Hellenic Civilization* 3rd edition, 178
Jones (D. M.) Grammatical Notes on Greek Epic Forms, 73; on de Man's *In Grammaticis Veritas*, 51; on Hakamies's *Étude sur l'origine et l'évolution du diminutif latin*, 107; on Scheller's *Die Oxytonierung der griechischen Substantiva auf -ia*, 194; on Tabachovitz's *Homerische ei-Sätze*, 194
Jones (D. Mervyn) on Roos's *Die tragische Orchestik im Zerrbild der altattischen Komödie*, 54; on Parsons's *The Alexandrian Library*, 217
 Jones's (L. W.) *An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings*, 174
Jones (W. H. S.) on Olivieri's *Aetii Amideni Libri Medicinales V-VIII*, 59
 Jones's (W. H. S.) *Pliny, Natural History xx-xxiii*, 121
 Kelling and Suskin's *Index Verborum Iuvenalis*, 204
Kenney (E. J.) *Ovid, Ars Amatoria i 147: 7*
 Kenyon's *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome* 2nd edition, 53
 Kerényi's *The Gods of the Greeks*, 36
Kerferd (G. B.) on Müller's *Studien zu den platonischen Nomoi*, 94; on Hamilton's *The Symposium of Plato*, 117; on Huber's *Platons dialektische Ideenlehre nach dem zweiten Teil des 'Parmenides'*, 196; on Reesor's *The Political Theory of the Middle Stoa*, 197; on Snell's *Theorie und Praxis im Denken des Abendlandes*, 218
Kilpatrick (G. D.) on van den Daele's *Indices Pseudo-Dionysiani*, 200
 Kinchin Smith's *The Trojan Women of Euripides*, 116
 Labourt's *Saint Jérôme, Lettres (II)*, 204
 Lacroix's *L'Histoire dans l'Antiquité*, 215
 Laidlaw's *Latin Literature*, 201
 Laistner's *Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire*, 127
 La Penna's *Properzio*, 25
 Latham's *Lucretius*, 202
 Lavarenne's *Prudence, Le Livre des Couronnes, Dittochaon, Épilogue*, 123
 Legrand's *Hérodote, Livre VII*, 116
 Lenchantin's *Tacitus, Agricola, Dialogus*, 29
 Levi's *Suetoni Divus Augustus*, 104; his *Il tempo di Augusto*, 181
 Lewis and Reinhold's *Roman Civilisation (I)*, 214
 Linforth's *Religion and Drama in 'Oedipus at Colonus'*, 150
 Lippold's *Die Griechische Plastik*, 190
 Lob's *Cicéron, Pour Marcellus, pour Ligarius, pour le roi Déjotarus*, 173
 Loeb Classical Library: *Dio Chrysostom (V)*, 120; *Livy (XIII)*, 203
 Loenen's *De nous in het systeem van Plato's filosofie*, 156
 Löfstedt's *Coniectanea*, 124
 Lopuszanski's *La date de la capture de Valérien et la chronologie des empereurs gaulois*, 126
 Lord's *A Structural Latin Course (I)*, 192
Lucas (D. W.) on Ammendola's *Euripide, Medea*, 54; on Maddalena's *Interpretazioni Eschilee*, 86; on Baldry's *Greek Literature for the Modern Reader*, 87; on Kinchin Smith's *The Trojan Women of Euripides*, 116; on Morison's *Sophocles, Ajax, The Women of Trachis*, 196
Luce (J. V.) Reply to Cherniss, 131; on des Places, Diès, and Gernet's *Platon, Les Lois i-vi*, 96
 Łukasiewicz's *Aristotle's Syllogistic*, 118
 lymphatus, 32
 McDermott and Caldwell's *Readings in the History of the Ancient World*, 215
McDonald (A. H.) on Schlesinger's *Livy, Books xliii-xlv*, 203
McKay (K. L.) *The Oxyrhynchus Historian and the outbreak of the 'Corinthian War'*, 6
MacKay (L. A.) *Lucan i 76-77: 145*
 McKinlay's *Aratoris Subdiaconi De Actibus Apostolorum*, 206
 Maddalena's *Interpretazioni Eschilee*, 86; his *Thucydides Historiarum liber primus*, 158
Maguinness (W. S.) on Marache's *La critique de la langue latine au II^e siècle de notre ère*, 205
 Manni's *L'Impero di Gallieno*, 60; his *Demetrio Poliorcete*, 208
Manson (T. W.) on Metzger's *Index of Articles on the New Testament and the Early Church*, 57; on Laistner's *Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire*, 127; on Repo's *Der Begriff 'Rhēma' im Biblisch-Griechischen*, 199
 Marache's *La critique de la langue latine au II^e siècle de notre ère*, 205
 Marias's *Aristóteles, Política*, 117
Martin (R. H.) on Fuchs's *Tacitus, Annales and Lenchantin's Tacitus, Agricola, Dialogus*, 27
 Martinazzoli's *La 'Successio' di Marco Aurelio*, 120
 Mazzarino's *Aspetti Sociali del Quarto Secolo*, 113
 Meander 1952, 223
 Merkelbach's *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee*, 14
 Mette's *Der Pfeilschuß des Pandaros*, 53
 Metzger's *Index of Articles on the New Testament and the Early Church*, 57
 Milne's *An Anthology of Classical Latin*, 192
 Mireaux's *La reine Bérénice*, 126
 Mnemosyne summarized (4th series V ii), 67; (V iii), 132
 Mondolfo's *Il Pensiero Antico*, 24
 Morison's *Sophocles, Ajax, The Women of Trachis*, 196
Morrison (J. S.) *Xenophon, Memorabilia i 6: 3*
 Müller's *Studien zu den platonischen Nomoi*, Murie's *Laux Satyra*, 192

Myres (J. L.) on Tarn's *The Greeks in Bactria* 2nd edition, 125

Nephele and the Ram, 143

Neuenschwander's *Mark Aurels Beziehungen zu Seneca und Poseidonios*, 166

Neugebauer's *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity*, 207

Norwood (G.), *Festschrift* for, 222

Olivieri's *Aetii Amideni Libri Medicinales V–VIII*, 59

Onians's *The Origin of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time and Fate*, 31

Oświecimski's *De scriptorum Romanorum vestigiis apud Tertullianum obviis*, 123

Owens's *The Doctrine of Being in the Aristotelian Metaphysics*, 22

Page (D. L.) The new fragment of Ibycus in *P.Oxy.* 2260: 1

Page's *A New Chapter in the History of Greek Tragedy*, 115; his *Alcman's Partheneion*, 16

papyri, 1, 6, 79, 144, 176, 186

Paratore's *Una nuova ricostruzione del 'De Poetis' di Suetonio* 2nd edition, 58

Parsons's *The Alexandrian Library*, 217

Paton's *Chapters on Mediaeval and Renaissance Visitors to Greek Lands*, 57

Perry's *Aesopica* (I), 154

Plattner (M.) on Cooper's *An Introduction to the Latin Hexameter*, 167

pompa circensis, 7

popular series, some new books in, 69

Potter (K. R.) on Johnstone's *Annales Gandenses*, 130

Poynton (J. B.) Two Notes on Statius, *Thebaid*, 145

praecordia, 32

Radin's *Die religiöse Erfahrung der Naturvölker*, 65

Rank's *Etymologiseering en verwante Verschujselen bij Homerus*, 195

Rattenbury (R. M.) on Page's *A New Chapter in the History of Greek Tragedy*, 115

Rees (B. R.) on Roberts and Turner's *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library* (IV), 176

Rees (D. A.) on Owens's *The Doctrine of Being in the Aristotelian Metaphysics*, 22; on Foster and Humphries's *Aristotle's De Anima*, 119; on Cilento's *Plotino, Enneadi*, 163; on Neuenschwander's *Mark Aurels Beziehungen zu Seneca und Poseidonios*, 166

Reesor's *The Political Theory of the Old and Middle Stoa*, 197

Repo's *Der Begriff 'Rhēma' im Biblisch-Griechischen*, 199

Revue de Philologie summarized (XXV 2), 67; (XXVI 1–2), 68

Rheinisches Museum summarized (VC 2), 68; (VC 3), 133; (VC 4, XCVI 1–2), 221

Rice (D. T.) on Weitzmann's *Greek Mythology in Byzantine Art*, 63

Richter's *Three Critical Periods in Greek Sculpture*, 210

Roberts and Turner's *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library* (IV), 176

Robertson (D. S.) Dike and Ares, 79

Robertson (C. M.) on Buschor's *Maussollos und Alexander*, 60; on Drerup's *Ägyptische Bildnisköpfe griechischer und römischer Zeit*, 209

Robins's *Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory*, 51

Robinson (D. M.), *Festschrift* for, (I), 49; (II), 222

Robinson (R.) on Łukasiewicz's *Aristotle's Syllogistic*, 118

Robinson's (C. A.) *Ancient History*, 39

Roebuck's *Corinth* (XIV), 129

Ronnet's *Étude sur le style de Démosthène dans les discours politiques*, 161

Roos's *Die tragische Orchestik im Zerrbild der altattischen Komödie*, 54

Rose (H. J.) on Grimal's *Dictionnaire de la mythologie grecque et romaine*, 34; on Kerényi's *The Gods of the Greeks*, 36; on Radin's *Die religiöse Erfahrung der Naturvölker*, 65; on Dodds's *The Greeks and the Irrational*, 82; on Séchan's *Le Mythe de Prométhée*, 124; on de Lepper's *De Godsdienst der Romeinen*, 124; on Perry's *Aesopica* (I), 154

Ross's *Plato's Theory of Ideas*, 91

Russell (D. A.) on Joachim's *Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*, 20

Sandbach (F. H.) on La Penna's *Properzio*, 25

Scheller's *Die Oxytonierung der griechischen Substantiva auf -ia*, 194

Schlesinger's *Liuy, Books xliii–xlv*, 203

school books, 192

Schwartz's *Lucien, Philopseudes et De Morte Peregrini*, 198

Scranton's *Corinth* (I part iii), 128

Scullard (H. H.) Ennius, Cato, and Surus, 140

Scullard's *Roman Politics, 220–150 B.C.*, 179; his *A History of the Roman World, 753–146 B.C.*, 212

Séchan's *Le Mythe de Prométhée*, 124

S.E.G., plan for twelfth and subsequent vols. of, 70

Siemers's *Seneca's Hercules Furens en Euripides' Heracles*, 206

Simon (J. H.) on Ziegler's *Cicero, De Legibus*, 172; on Lob's *Cicéron, Pour Marcellus, pour Ligarius, pour le roi Déjotarus*, 173; on François's *Ciceronis Cato Maior de Senectute Liber*, 203

Skemp (J. B.) on Dupréel's *Les Sophistes*, 155; on Untersteiner's *I Sofisti* (II), 196

Skutsch (O.) on Büchner and Hofmann's *Lateinische Literatur und Sprache in der Forschung seit 1937*, 200

Smith (W. K.) on Paratore's *Una nuova ricostruzione del 'De Poetis' di Suetonio* 2nd edition, 58

Smyth (W. R.) on Bonazzi's *Propertius Resartus*, 101; on Siemers's *Seneca's Hercules Furens en Euripides' Heracles*, 206

Snell's *Theorie und Praxis im Denken des Abendlandes*, 218

Socrátēs' encounters with Antiphon, 3
 Soviet Union, classical philology in, 223
 Steidle's *Sueton und die antike Biographie*, 122
Stubbings (F. H.) on Angel's *Troy: The Human Remains*, 216; on Blegen, Caskey, and Rawson's *Troy* (II), 216
Studia Oliveriana (I), 222
Studies presented to D. M. Robinson (I), 49; (II), 222
 SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 66, 132, 219
 Sundwall's *Kleinasiatische Nachträge*, 42
surus, 141
Symbolae Osloenses summarized (XXIX), 69

Tabachovitz's *Homerische ei-Sätze*, 194
 Tarn's *The Greeks in Bactria* 2nd edition, 125
 Tarn and Griffith's *Hellenic Civilization* 3rd edition, 178
Tate (J.) on Tuckey's *Plato's Charmides*, 18; on Mondolfo's *Il Pensiero Antico*, 24; on Onians's *The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time and Fate*, 31; on Ross's *Plato's Theory of Ideas*, 91; on de Montmollin's *La Poétique d'Aristote*, 98; on Huijbregtse's *Xenophon, Anabasis*, 117; on Fränkel's *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*, 146; on Loenen's *De nous in het systeem van Plato's filosofie*, 156; on Yale *Classical Studies* (XII), 191; on Theiler's *Kaiser Marc Aurel, Wege zu sich selbst*, 198
 teachers of classics, conferences of, 69
 Theander's *Plutarch und die Geschichte*, 198
 Theiler's *Kaiser Marc Aurel, Wege zu sich selbst*, 198
 Thierfelder's *Plautus, Rudens and Terentius, Andria*, 121
Thompson (E. A.) on Homeyer's *Attila der Hunnenkönig*, 217
 Thompson's *A Roman Reformer and Inventor*, 106

Thomson (H. J.) on Lavarenne's *Prudence, Le Livre des Couronnes, Dittochaon, Épilogue*, 123
 town-planning of Greek cities, 69
Toynbee (J. M. C.) on Herbig and others' *Vermächtnis der antiken Kunst*, 61; on *Festgabe für A. von Salis*, 209; on Budde's *Jugendbildnisse des Caracalla und Geta*, 213
 Trümper's *Kriegerische Fachausdrücke im griechischen Epos*, 148
 Tuckey's *Plato's Charmides*, 18
Turner (E. G.) on Davis's *Race-Relationships in Ancient Egypt*, 44; on Johnson's *Egypt and the Roman Empire*, 184

Untersteiner's *I Sofisti* (II), 196

van den Daele's *Indices Pseudo-Dionysiani*, 200
 von Salis (A.), *Festschrift* for, 209

Waern's *Ἰῆς Ὀσρέα*, 54

Walbank (F. W.) on Hartke's *Römische Kinderkaiser*, 47; on Broughton's *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* (I), 111; on Lopuzanski's *La date de la capture de Valérien et la chronologie des empereurs gaulois*, 126; on Mireaux's *La reine Bérénice*, 126
 Waldock's *Sophocles the Dramatist*, 150
 Walser's *Rom, das Reich und die fremden Völker*, 59

Webster (T. B. L.) on Beazley's *The Development of Attic Black-Figure*, 128
 Weitzmann's *Greek Mythology in Byzantine Art*, 63

Whitman's *Sophocles*, 150

Whittick (G. C.) on Legrand's *Hérodote, Livre VII*, 116; on Latham's *Lucretius*, 202

Yale Classical Studies (XII), 191

Ziegler's *Cicero, De Legibus*, 172
 Zuckor's *Plotin und Lykopolis*, 56

II. INDEX LOCORUM

Note—'passim' means that several passages of the author or work are dealt with at the given place

Aeschylus *Eu.* 681 ff.: 80. fr. 377 N²: 79
Anth. Lat. 415 19: 14
Anth. Pal. v 244 (245) 3-4: 13
 Apollodorus i 6 1-2: 1; i 9 1: 143; iii 14 2: 80
 Aristophanes *Ach.* 707: 137. *Nu.* 130: 138. *Ra.* 818-21: 137; 1129: 138. *Th.* 1011: 138. *V.* 1501-2: 144
 Aristotle *Phys.* iv. 221^a30-31: 78

Bacchylides 11 106 Snell: 1

Cato *Orig.* 88 Peter: 142
 Cicero *De Or.* iii 78: 144. *Sest.* 19: 143
 Culex 272-6: 80

Dio liii 32 5: 10
 Dionysius Halicarnassensis vii 1 1, 72: 8

Ennius *Ann.* fr. 525 Vahlen³: 140
 Euphorion fr. 74 Scheidweiler: 75
 Euripides *El.* 1254-63: 80. *Hipp.* 924: 2. *IT* 945 f.: 80; 1340-1: 2. *Or.* 1668-9: 2. *Phoen.* 1040: 73. *Rhes.* 863-4: 3
 [Euripides] *Ep.* 5: 144

Festus p. 362 26 L., p. 382 25 L.: 140

Hellanicus fr. 69, 82 Müller (38, 169 Jacoby): 80

Hesiod *Sc.* 92-93: 73. *Th.* 313-14: 144

Hippocrates *Aër.* 23-24, *Coac.* 23, *Prog.* 8, 17: 138

Homer *Il.* i 555-6: 2; ii 791: 75; v 181: 76; x 97: 3; x 538: 2; xi 463: 74; xii 365, xvi 41: 76; xvii 395, xviii 160, xix 424: 74; xx 81, xxi 254: 75; xxi 332: 77; xxiii 66: 75.

- Od.* iv 247: 77; v 337, 353, ix 321, xi 363: 76; xiii 288, xvi 157: 75; xx 1 ff.: 139; xx 31: 75; xxi 393 ff.: 3; xxiv 295: 75
hymn. Hom. Dem. 478-9, *Pan* 18: 73
- IG*² ii/iii 2318, 2325 6: 144
Ion fr. 39 Nauck: 73
- Lucan* i 75-80: 145; iii 566, iv 457 ff.: 13; iv 593: 14; vii 134 ff.: 145
Lucian Hes. 5: 138
Lygdamus 4 87: 143
- Moschion* 187: 73
- Ovid AA* i 143-7: 7; i 328: 10; iii 173-8: 142; iii 189: 143. *Am.* iii 2 43 ff.: 7. *F.* iii 868 ff.: 143; iv 391: 7; iv 714-15: 143; v 178: 144. *Her.* xviii (xix) 121 ff., *Met.* vii 408, 703, *Tr.* iii 12 (13) 3: 143
- POxy.* v 842: 6; xx 2256 fr. 3: 144; xx 2256 fr. 9a30 ff.: 79; xx 2260 col. ii 23 ff.: 1
Paulinus Carm. 16 219-23: 81
Pausanias iii 9 9 ff.: 6; ix 11 4: 1
Pindar I. i 41-45: 77. *N.* vii 90: 78
- Plato Ap.* 20 a: 138. *Lg.* 721 b-c: 131. *Lys.* 215 c ff.: 5. *Phd.* 60 d: 138; 94 d: 139. *Phdr.* 237 b-256 e: 5; 260 b-c, 267 a: 137. *R.* iii 411 b 2: 78; *passim*: 139. *Symp.* 208 a-b. *Tim.* 90: 131
Pliny NH viii 11: 140; ix 137 f., xvi 77, xxii 4: 143
Propertius iv 9 22: 14
- Quintus Smyrnaeus* xii 411: 75
- Res Gestae* 34 3: 12
- Seneca Herc. Fur.* 578 ff.: 81. *Herc. Oet.* 1256: 144. *NQ* iii 27 ff.: 145; iv 5 1: 81
Sophocles OT 334-5: 13
Statius Silv. iii 2 17: 14. *Theb.* ii 643, v 742-3, vi 3-4, vi 847-8, xi 528-9: 145
- Trag. Adesp.* 237: 74
- Virgil A.* i 51: 14; iii 309 ff.: 82; vi 431: 80. *E.* i 1, *G.* iv 566: 82
- Xenophon An.* iv 5 36, *Cyn.* 4 4, 7 5: 139. *Cyrop.* iv 5 42: 5. *Eg.* i 8, 9 1, 9 2, 9 7, 9 8, 10 17: 139. *HG* iii 5 3 ff.: 6. *Mem.* i 6: 3; iv 1 3, *Symp.* 2 10: 139

III. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

- | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| ἀσπίς, 149 | κατατήκειν, 78 | πεῖραρ, 34 |
| ἀχέω, 73 | λόγος, 199 | ῥῆμα, 199 |
| εἰκώς, 75 | μάχη, 17 | σάκος, 149 |
| ἐῖσκειν, 76 | μή clauses, 2 | σκινδάλαμοι, 138 |
| ἐκλογή, 177 | μοῖρα, 34 | παρχύειν, 33 |
| εἶκα, 74 | ὄργή, 78 | τέλος, 34 |
| ῥκειν, 75 | παραδόνα, 137 | τήκειν, 78 |
| θυμοειδής, 138 | παραξόνια, 137 | ὑποδήλωσις, 138 |
| θυμός, 32, 138 | παραψόγια, 137 | φρένες, 32 |
| ιάχειν, 74 | παρέπαινος, 137 | ψυχή, 33 |
| κατακέσθαι, 77 | | |

CLIMES
KING'S COLLEGE
LIBRARY
LONDON

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOLUME III NUMBER 1

(Vol. LXVII of the continuous series)

March 1953

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE
GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE : OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

Editors C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

All communications intended for the Editors should be sent to Mr. Fordyce. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher, Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Professor E. H. Warmington, M.A. (Chairman)	} <i>Representing the Council of the Classical Association</i>
Professor R. G. Austin, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)	
F. H. Sandbach, M.A.	
Professor F. W. Walbank, M.A.	
W. S. Watt, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)	
N. G. L. Hammond, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society	
M. Platnauer, B.Litt., M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society	

With the co-operation of

Professor B. D. Meritt, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton,
Professor J. A. FitzHerbert, University of Adelaide, and
Professor Homer A. Thompson, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

New Series

Volume III, No. 1

March 1953

CONTENTS

The new fragment of Ibycus in P. Oxy. 2260	D. L. PAGE	1
The aorist in $\mu\eta$ clauses	N. M. HOLLEY	2
Xenophon, <i>Memorabilia</i> i. 6: the encounters of Socrates and Antiphon	J. S. MORRISON	3
The Oxyrhynchus Historian and the outbreak of the Corinthian War	K. L. MCKAY	6
Ovid, <i>Ars Amatoria</i> i. 147	E. J. KENNEY	7
Some remarks on the Augustan Constitution	J. A. CROOK	10
<i>Anth. Pal.</i> v. 244 (245). 3-4	A. Y. CAMPBELL	13
Lucan iv. 457 ff.	S. F. BONNER	13

REVIEWS:

Untersuchungen zur Odyssee (Merkelbach), J. A. DAVISON, 14; *Alcman's Partheneion* (Page), J. A. DAVISON, 16; *Plato's Charmides* (Tuckey), J. TATE, 18; *The Nicomachean Ethics* (Joachim), D. A. RUSSELL, 20; *The Doctrine of Being in Aristotelian Metaphysics* (Owens), D. A. REES, 22; *Il Pensiero Antico* (Mondolfo), J. TATE, 24; *Properzio* (La Penna), F. H. SANDBACH, 25; *Tacitus, Annales* (Fuchs); *Agricola, Dialogus* (Lenchantin de Gubernatis), R. H. MARTIN, 27; *The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate* (Onians), J. TATE, 31; *Dictionnaire de la mythologie grecque et romaine* (Grimal), H. J. ROSE, 34; *The Gods of the Greeks* (Kerényi), H. J. ROSE, 36; *Studi di Storia della Storiografia greca* (De Sanctis), A. W. GOMME, 37; *Ancient History* (Robinson), M. CARY, 39; *La Démocratie athénienne* (Cloché), N. G. L. HAMMOND, 41; *Kleinasiatische Nachträge* (Sundwall), P. M. FRASER, 42; *Race-Relationships in Ancient Egypt* (Davis), E. G. TURNER, 44; *City-State and World-State* (Hammond), N. G. L. HAMMOND, 45; *Römische Kinderkaiser* (Hartke), F. W. WALBANK, 47; *Studies presented to D. M. Robinson*, R. M. COOK, 49; *Ancient and Mediaeval Grammatical Theory* (Robins); *In Grammaticis Veritas* (de Man), D. M. JONES, 51.

[Continued on p. 3 of cover]

Continued from p. 2 of cover]

Short Reviews	53
Summaries of Periodicals	66
Notes and News	69
Books Received	70

The Classical Association

The objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association. They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 18s., *Quarterly* £1; combined subscription £1. 15s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 14s.

Copies of the final issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (covering the years 1945-7) can still be obtained from Messrs. J. W. Arrowsmith, Quay Street, Bristol, for 10s. (for members of the Association, 6s.), and the volume for 1939-45 for 6s. from Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, who can also supply most of the pre-war back numbers at 2s. 6d. per volume, post free.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. J. S. Shields, Queen Mary's School, Basingstoke, Hants. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melluish, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, Cambridge, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northampton, North Staffordshire, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western, Swansea.



The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

† T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D. † W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

† E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.

L. A. POST, M.A.

E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

Each volume Foolsap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 15s. net

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—*Times Literary Supplement*.

NEW VOLUMES, 1953

LATIN

398 PRUDENTIUS. Two volumes. Vol. II. H. J. Thomson.

GREEK

390 DIODORUS SICULUS. Twelve volumes. Vol. X. R. M. Geer.

380, 401, PHILO. Supplementary volumes. Translated from an ancient Armenian Text by Ralph Marcus.

Vol. I. Questions and Answers on Genesis.

Vol. II. Questions and Answers on Exodus.

William Heinemann, Ltd., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

METHUEN'S CLASSICAL TEXTS

General Editor: W. S. MAGUINNESS

VIRGIL: AENEID, Book XII.

Edited by W. S. Maguinness. 5s. 9d. With Vocab. 6s. 9d. *(In the press)*

CAESAR: GALLIC WAR, Books II and III.

Edited by S. A. Handford. 4s. 6d. With Vocab. 5s. 6d.

TACITUS: HISTORIES, Books I and II.

Edited by A. L. Irvine. 7s. 6d. With Vocab. 8s.

TACITUS: THE ANNALS, Book XIV.

Edited by E. C. Woodcock. 7s. 6d. With Vocab. 8s.

CICERO: VERRINE V.

Edited by R. G. C. Levens. 8s. With Vocab. 8s. 6d.

HERODOTUS, Book II.

Edited by W. G. Waddell. 7s. 6d. With Vocab. 8s. 6d.

HOMER: THE ILIAD, Book XI.

Edited by E. S. Forster. 3s. With Vocab. 3s. 6d.

LIVY, Book XXX.

Edited by H. E. Butler and H. H. Scullard. 4s. 9d. With Vocab. 5s. 6d.

PLATO: REPUBLIC, Book I.

Edited by D. J. Allan. 5s. With Vocab. 5s. 6d.

METHUEN



THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOLUME III NUMBER 2

(Vol. LXVII of the continuous series)

June 1953

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MESSINGDON
GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

Editors C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

All communications intended for the Editors should be sent to Mr. Fordyce. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher, Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Professor E. H. Warmington, M.A. (Chairman)	} <i>Representing the Council of the Classical Association</i>
Professor R. G. Austin, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)	
F. H. Sandbach, M.A.	
Professor F. W. Walbank, M.A.	
Professor W. S. Watt, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)	
N. G. L. Hammond, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society	
M. Platnauer, B.Litt., M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society	

With the co-operation of

Professor B. D. Meritt, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton,
Professor J. A. FitzHerbert, University of Adelaide, and
Professor Homer A. Thompson, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

New Series

Volume III, No. 2

June 1953

CONTENTS

Grammatical Notes on Greek Epic Forms	D. M. JONES	73
Pindar, <i>Isthmia</i> i. 41	A. J. BEATTIE	77
Dike and Ares	D. S. ROBERTSON	79
<i>Culex</i> 272-6	A. HUDSON-WILLIAMS	80

REVIEWS:

The Greeks and the Irrational (Dodds), H. J. ROSE, 82; *Interpretazioni Eschilee* (Maddalena), D. W. LUCAS, 86; *Greek Literature for the Modern Reader* (Baldry), D. W. LUCAS, 87; *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, III. B (Jacoby), A. W. GOMME, 89; *Plato's Theory of Ideas* (Ross), J. TATE, 91; *Studien zu den platonischen Nomoi* (Müller), G. B. KERFERD, 94; *Platon, Les Lois* i-vi (des Places), J. V. LUCE, 96; *La Poétique d'Aristote* (de Montmollin), J. TATE, 98; *Chion of Heraclea* (Düring), H. LL. HUDSON-WILLIAMS, 100; *Propertius Resartus* (Bonazzi), W. R. SMYTH, 101; *Ovidii Tristium liber iv* (de Jonge), O. A. W. DILKE, 103; *Suetoni Divus Augustus* (Levi), T. J. CADOUX, 104; *A Roman Reformer* (Thompson), R. BROWNING, 106; *Étude sur l'origine et l'évolution du diminutif latin* (Hakamies), D. M. JONES, 107; *Horoi* (Fine), P. B. R. FORBES, 109; *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, i (Broughton), F. W. WALBANK, 111; *Aspetti Sociali del Quarto Secolo* (Mazzarino), A. H. M. JONES, 113.

Short Reviews	115
Correspondence	131
Summaries of Periodicals	132
Notes and News	133
Books Received	134

The Classical Association

The objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association. They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 18s., *Quarterly* £1; combined subscription £1. 15s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 14s.

Copies of the final issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (covering the years 1945-7) can still be obtained from Messrs. J. W. Arrowsmith, Quay Street, Bristol, for 10s. (for members of the Association, 6s.), and the volume for 1939-45 for 6s. from Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, who can also supply most of the pre-war back numbers at 2s. 6d. per volume, post free.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. J. S. Shields, Queen Mary's School, Basingstoke, Hants. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Mellaish, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, Cambridge, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northampton, North Staffordshire, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western, Swansea.

PRINTED IN
GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
OXFORD
BY
CHARLES BATEY
PRINTER
TO THE
UNIVERSITY

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOLUME III NUMBERS 3, 4

(Vol. LXVII of the continuous series)

December 1953

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE
GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE — DISTRIBUTOR — UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

Editors C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

All communications intended for the Editors should be sent to Mr. Fordyce, Books for review should be sent to the Publisher, Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Professor E. H. Warmington, M.A. (Chairman)	} <i>Representing the Council of the Classical Association</i>
Professor R. G. Austin, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)	
F. H. Sandbach, M.A.	
Professor F. W. Walbank, M.A., F.B.A.	
W. S. Watt, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)	
N. G. L. Hammond, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society	
M. Platnauer, B.Litt., M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society	

With the co-operation of

Professor B. D. Meritt, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton,
Professor J. A. FitzHerbert, University of Adelaide, and
Professor Homer A. Thompson, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

New Series

Volume III, Nos. 3, 4

December 1953

CONTENTS

Aristophanes, <i>Frogs</i> 818-21	A. Y. CAMPBELL	137
The Origin of <i>θυμοειδής</i>	E. L. HARRISON	138
Ennius, Cato, and Surus	H. H. SCULLARD	140
The Ram and Cerberus (Ovid, <i>A.A.</i> iii. 173-8, <i>Met.</i> vii. 408-9)	W. M. EDWARDS	142
Ox. Pap. 2256, fr. 3	J. A. DAVISON	144
Cicero, <i>De Oratore</i> iii. 78	R. BROWNING	144
Lucan i. 76-77	L. A. MACKAY	145
Two notes on Statius, <i>Thebaid</i>	J. B. POYNTON	145

REVIEWS:

Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums (Fränkel), J. TATE, 146; *Kriegerische Fachausdrücke im griechischen Epos* (Trümper), J. A. DAVISON, 148; *Sophocles* (Whitman); *Sophocles the Dramatist* (Waldock); *Religion and Drama in 'Oedipus at Colonus'* (Linforth); *The Imagery of Sophocles' Antigone* (Goheen), A. D. FITTON BROWN, 150; *Aesopica* (Perry), H. J. ROSE, 154; *Les Sophistes* (Dupréel), J. B. SKEMP, 155; *De nous in het systeem van Plato's filosofie* (Loenen), J. TATE, 156; *Thucydides historiarum liber i* (Maddalena), A. W. GOMME, 158; *Étude sur le style de Démosthène* (Ronnet), H. LL. HUDSON-WILLIAMS, 161; *Plotino, Enneadi* (Cilento), D. A. REES, 163; *Mark Aurels Beziehungen zu Seneca und Poseidonios* (Neuenschwander), D. A. REES, 166; *An Introduction to the Latin Hexameter* (Cooper), M. PLATNAUER, 167; *Verschmähntes zu Vergil, Horaz und Properz* (Dornseiff), L'ÂGE D'ARGENT DORÉ (Herimann), H. H. HUXLEY, 169; *Martialis* (Giarratano), A. HUDSON-WILLIAMS, 171; *Cicero, De Legibus* (Ziegler), J. H. SIMON, 172; *Cicéron, Discours*, xviii (Lob), J. H. SIMON, 173; *Cassiodorus, Introduction to Divine and Human Readings* (Jones), D. R. BRADLEY, 174; *Catalogue of Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library* (Roberts and Turner), B. R. REES, 176; *Hellenistic Civilization* (Tarn and Griffith), A. H. M. JONES, 178; *Roman Politics, 220-150 B.C.* (Scullard), G. E. F. CHILVER, 179; *Il tempo di Augusto* (Levi), T. J. CADOUX, 181; *Egypt and the Roman Empire* (Johnson), E. G. TURNER, 184; *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of A. C. Johnson*, P. M. FRASER, 186; *Padova Romana* (Gasparotto), G. E. F. CHILVER, 188; *Die griechische Plastik* (Lippold), R. M. COOK, 190; *Yale Classical Studies*, xii, J. TATE, 191; *Some School Books*, M. EDWARDS, 192.

[Continued on p. 3 of cover]

9 MAR 1954

Continued from p. 2 of cover]

Short Reviews	193
Summaries of Periodicals	219
Notes and News	222
Books Received	223
Index	227

The Classical Association

The objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association. They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 18s., *Quarterly* £1; combined subscription £1. 15s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 14s.

Copies of the final issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (covering the years 1945-7) can still be obtained from Messrs. J. W. Arrowsmith, Quay Street, Bristol, for 10s. (for members of the Association, 6s.), and the volume for 1939-45 for 6s. from Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, who can also supply most of the pre-war back numbers at 2s. 6d. per volume, post free.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. J. S. Shields, Queen Mary's School, Basingstoke, Hants. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melliush, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, Cambridge, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northampton, North Staffordshire, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western, Swansea.



THE DIALOGUES OF PLATO

*Translated into English, with analyses and introductions by B. JOWETT.
Fourth edition, in four volumes, revised (by order of the Jowett Copyright
Trustees) under the editorship of D. J. ALLAN and H. E. DALE. £6. 6s. net*

It was Jowett's wish, expressed in the instructions he gave to his Copyright Trustees, that his own works should be republished from time to time. He himself supervised the third edition of the dialogues, which appeared in 1892; but since then, apart from a photographic reprint in 1924, there has been no republication of the whole work until now. In this new edition the editors have endeavoured to revise the translation while taking care not to mutilate it or impair the uniformity of the style. With regard to the Introductions, they have thought it best not to rewrite these, or to insert new passages or extensive footnotes; but to omit several passages which are not closely concerned with the interpretation of the dialogues and which, with the lapse of time, have lost much of their interest. Many of these are passages added by Jowett in the later editions. Where it seemed necessary, or relevant, some indication of modern views on questions of scholarship has been added; and there is a new general Preface which recounts the history of the work, and gives some appreciation of Jowett's services to the study of Plato, especially in England. The analyses of the dialogues, and the Index, are retained, but the sequence of dialogues has been altered, and there are other minor changes of form.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

BLACKWELL'S

*Now available
post free*

GREEK & LATIN CLASSICS

Catalogue No. 595 (1)
1953

ARE YOU ON OUR
MAILING LIST?



BROAD
ST.

OXFORD

